THE 'ANCREN RIWLE.'

UNDER the heading, *Die Ancren Riwle—ein aus angelsächsischer Zeit überliefertes Denkmal,* Dr W. Heuser in the *Anglia* XXX, 103 sqq. calls attention to MS. Laud Misc. 201 in the Bodleian, a seventeenth century MS. in the handwriting of W. L'isle, which, besides a copy of *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter* (Trinity College, Cambridge), contains certain prayers from the *Ancren Riwle,* taken, as L'isle tells us, 'out of the Nunnes Rules of St James Order in Bennet College Library' (*i.e.,* Corpus Christi College, Cambridge). Heuser prints these prayers from MS. Laud and as a parallel text gives the corresponding passages from the hitherto unprinted early thirteenth century MS. of the *Ancren Riwle* in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (MS. 402). The theory which Heuser puts forward is that the prayers in the Laud MS. are copied from a lost *Ancren Riwle* MS. dating from the transition period from Old to Middle English, and that this lost MS., like the other 'modernised' writings of that period, points back to an O.E. original. He says, 'Trotz seiner beschränktheit ist das material des Laud-ms. von der grössten wichtigkeit für die A. R-forschung, da es wenigstens bis in die ags. übergangszeit zurückführt, wahrscheinlich aber, wie alle "modernisierten" denkmäler dieser periode auf das Ags. selber zurückweist.'

It seems to me that the actual facts point in quite a different direction, and I think it admits of direct proof that L'isle's extracts were copied from the existing early thirteenth century MS. C.C.C. 402, and that the archaisms on which Heuser lays such stress were intentionally introduced by him[1].

For convenience of reference I give the two texts, both of which I have myself collated with the MSS.

[1] I do not urge the point—though it might be urged—that it is unlikely that a C.C.C. MS., carefully guarded as these MSS. have always been, should have been lost, or that C.C.C. should have been in possession of two *Ancren Riwle* MSS. which agree so closely (except for the archaisms) in wording and spelling.

MS. Laud Misc. 201[1] (fol. 264).

To þam halga*n* þrynnesse.

Ealmihtig god · fæder · suna 7 hælig gast · as ge beoð þreo an god · ealswa ge beoð an mihte · an wisdom · 7 an luue · 7 þeah is mihte iturned to þe in halig writ · nomeliche þu deorewurðe fæder · to þe wisdom sælig suna · to þe luue hælig gast · geof me an ælmihtig god þrile on þreo hades þæs ilce þreo thinges · mihte þe to þeowian · wisdome þe to cwemian · luue 7 wil to don hit · mihte ꝥ ic mage don · wisdom ꝥ ic cunne don · luue ꝥ ic wulle don aa ꝥ þe is leofest · as þu eart fulle of euch gód · ealswa nis nan gód wonne þere as þeos þreo beoð · mihte · wisdom · 7 luue gemette togederes · ꝥ þu getti me þam halig þrinnesse ic þe wurðscipe of þreo p*ater* nos*tres*.

To þam hælende criste.

La ih*esu* þin are · ih*esu* for mine synnas ahongen on rode · for þas ylca fif wundas þe þu on hire bleddest · heal mine blody sawle of ealle þa synnas ꝥ heo is wið gewundod þurh mine fif wittes i þe munigunge of ham ꝥ hit swa mote beon deorewurðe hlaford fif p*ater* nos*tres* · 7 ct.

An oðer.

For þa seofen gyftas þæs halgan gastes ꝥ ic ham mote hæbben · 7 for þa seofen tidas ꝥ hælig kirc singaþ · ꝥ ic deale in ham slepe ic oð wacige · 7 for þa seofen bonen i þe p*ater* nos*ter* ongean þa seofen heaued 7 deadlice synnan · ꝥ þu wite me wið þam 7 ealle heora broces · and geoue me þa seofene sælig ædignysses þe þu hlaford hæfst behaten þine gecorene · i þin ædig nome seofen · p*ater* nos*tres*.

An oðer.

For þa tyn heastes þe ic gebrocen hæbbe summe oðer eall · 7 me seoluen towart te hwet se beo of oðer hwet untreowelice i teoheðet i bote of þeos brucken[2] for te sahtni me wið þe deorewurðe hlaford · tyn p*ater* · nos*tres*.

[1] L'isle uses the O.E. ȝ both for 3 and *g*. I render it by *g*. MS. C.C.C. distinguishes between *g* and 3.

[2] MS. *brucken*, the *k* altered from *h*.

MS. C.C.C. 402 (fol. 6[b] bottom).

Almihti godd · feader · sune · hali gast · as 3e beoð þreo an godd · alswa 3e beoð an mihte · an wisdom · 7 an luue · 7 þah is mihte iturnd to þe in hali writ nomeliche · þu deorewurðe feader · to þe wisdom seli sune · to þe luue hali gast · 3ef me an almihti godd þrile i þreo hades · þes ilke þreo þinges · mihte forte serui þe · wisdom forte cweme þe · luue 7 wil to don hit · mihte ꝥ[1] ich mahe don · wisdom ꝥ ich cunne don · luue[1] ꝥ ich wulle don aa ꝥ te is leouest · as þu art ful of euch god . alswa nis na god[2] wone þer as þeose þreo beoð · mihte 7 wisdom · 7 luue iueiet togederes. ꝥ tu 3etti me ham hali þrumnesse i þe wurðschipe of þe þreo p*ater* nos*tres*.

A ih*esu* þin are · ih*esu* for mine sunnen ahonget o rode · for þe ilke fif wunden þe þu on hire bleddest heal mi blodi sawle of alle þe sunnen ꝥ ha is wið iwundet. Þurh mine fif wittes i þe munegunge of ham ꝥ hit swa mote beon deorewurðe lau*er*d fif p*ater* nos*tres*.

For þe seoue 3iftes of þe hali gast ꝥ ich ham mote habben · 7 for þe seoue tiden ꝥ hali chirche singeð ꝥ ich deale in ham slepe ich oðer wakie · 7 for þe seoue[3] bonen i þe p*ater* nos*ter* a3ein þe seouen heaued 7 deadliche sunnen · ꝥ tu wite me wið ham 7 alle hare brokes · 7 3eoue me þe seouene[4] selie eadinesses þe þu hauest lau*er*d bihaten þine icorene i þin eadi nome seoue p*ater* nos*tres*.

For þe ten heastes þe ich ibroken habbe · summe oðer alle · 7 me seoluen towart te hwet se beo of oðer hwet untreoweliche iteoheðet · ibote of þeose bruchen forte sahtni[5] me wið þe deorewurðe lau*er*d ten p*ater* nos*tres*.

[1] ꝥ...*luue* omitted by H.
[2] So MS., H. has go[d].
[3] So MS. H. *seouen*.
[4] So MS. H. *seoune*.
[5] So MS., H. has *sahtin*.

An oþer.

For þe wurðegunge ihesu crist of þine tweolfen apostolas · ⁊ ic mote ofer eall folgian heora lare · ⁊ ic mote hæbben þurh heora bonen þa tweolfe bohes þe bloweþ of chærite · swa seinte pawel writeð · blisfull hlaford · tweolf pater nostres.

Þe wurðgunge ihesu crist of þine tweof[1] apostles · ⁊ ich mote ouer al folhin hare lare · ⁊ ich mote habben þurh hare bonen þe tweolf bohes þe bloweþ of chearite as seinte pawel writeð blisfule lauerd tweolf pater nostres.

An oðer.

For ealle þa sawlen þe beoð forðfaren i þe bileaue of þa feower godspelles · þe healdaþ eall cristendom up o feower healues · ⁊ þu þa feower marhes geoue ham in heouene mihtfulle hlaford feower pater nostres.

For alle þe sawlen þe beoð forðfearen i þe bileaue of þe fowr goddspelles þe haldeð al cristendom up o fowr halues · ⁊ tu þe fowr marheȝeuen[2] ȝeoue ham in heouene · milzfule[3] lauerd fowr pater nostres.

[1] So MS., H. has *tweos*.

[2] MS. *marheȝeuen*, but the *ȝeuen* is crossed through.

[3] So MS., H. has *milȝfule*.

Heuser bases his conclusion as to the age of the MS. from which L'isle copied the extracts (1) on the forms of the letters and (2) on the language: 'Das alter unserer excerpte wird bewiesen durch die fast ganz ags. schriftzeichen...ferner durch den noch fast altenglischen stand der sprache mit erhaltenem *æ, y, ea, eo*,' etc.

The first point, the forms of the letters chosen by L'isle, proves nothing. He had just finished copying *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*, using the Anglo-Saxon characters for his transcript, and it was quite natural that, if he then added a few extracts from an early M.E. MS., he should continue to use the same form of letters rather than suddenly change and try to imitate the forms of the early M.E. hand.

As to the second point, the language: the extracts show, it is true, a curious mixture of O.E. and thirteenth century forms—very different from the ordinary twelfth century transcripts of O.E. originals—and the most natural explanation seems to be that the basis was a thirteenth century MS., and that the archaisms were introduced by L'isle, who evidently possessed a knowledge of O.E. considerable for his time. In 1623 he published, with a translation, Ælfric's *Treatise on the Old and New Testament*, to which he added Ælfric's *Easter Homily*, etc.[1] From his introduction to this we learn how, after his preliminary studies in O.E., he 'tooke heart to put forth and diue into the deep among the meere Saxon monuments of my worthily respected kinsman Sir H. Spelman, my honorable friend Sir Rob. Cotton, and of our Libraries in Cambridge.' I believe therefore that his knowledge of O.E. was

[1] Cp. Wülker, *Grundriss*, p. 11. I may add that this edition was reissued in 1638 with new title-pages as *Divers ancient monuments in the Saxon tongue*.

quite sufficient to enable him to introduce the archaisms (frequently very inaccurate[1]) which we find in the extracts and which distinguish them from the corresponding passages in the Corpus Christi College MS. Where the forms are not archaized, the two MSS. agree remarkably even in details of spelling. That L'isle rather liked trying to write O.E. is shown by his providing the prayers with O.E. headings—for these are obviously his additions—as he had already done in the case of the Canticles in *Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*[2].

In one instance we have direct proof that he did deliberately alter: in l. 45 of the extracts he first wrote *bruchen*, as in the Corpus Christi College MS., and then, apparently remembering that *ch* does not occur in O.E., he altered the *h* to *k*. But the evidence of the two MSS. enables us to go further—they afford us distinct proof that MS. C.C.C. 402 was the very MS. from which L'isle copied. In Morton's edition p. 30[17] MS. Nero A 14 reads: *þet tu þe vour morȝiuen* (MS. Cleopatra C 6 has *mareȝeuen*) *ȝiue ham inne heouene*, i.e., 'that thou give them the four morning-gifts[3] in heaven.' MS. C.C.C. 402 has *þ tu þe fowr marheȝeuen ȝeoue ham in heouene*, but the *ȝeuen* has been crossed through. As originally written it was, of course, correct, but the scribe, or some subsequent reader, not understanding it, thought that *ȝeuen*, which is the last word on one leaf, and *ȝeoue*, which is the first word on the next, were accidental repetitions of the same word, so he crossed the first out. L'isle, seeing it crossed out, omitted it in his copy, but judging that *feower* ought to be accompanied by a plural, changed *marhe* into *marhes*: hence the reading of MS. Laud, *þ þu þa feower marhes geoue ham in heouene*.

Further evidence in the same direction is afforded by the fact that in the first prayer the Corpus Christi College MS. has the form *alswa* twice, and *as* three times, and L'isle recognizing *alswa*, changed it each time to the well-known W. Saxon form *ealswa*, but not knowing that *as* is merely a worn-down form of the same word, did not attempt to archaize it, and copied it as *as* in all three instances. I think that this proves that all the available evidence does not take the *Ancren Riwle* back further than the beginning of the thirteenth century.

ARTHUR S. NAPIER.

OXFORD.

[1] The writer who composed the heading *Geleafa þara apostolas* was quite capable of altering *of alle þe sunnen* into *of ealle þa synnas*, l. 24. Cp. next note.

[2] *Sang Esayes, Sang Ezechies kyninges, Geleafa þara apostolas. Sang gebletsod Marian*, &c. Cp. Wanley, p. 100, and Wülker, *Grundriss*, p. 13.

[3] The gift given by the bridegroom to the bride on the morning after the wedding. O.E. *morgengifu*.

THE ELIZABETHAN 'TENNE TRAGEDIES OF SENECA.'

THE *Tenne Tragedies of Seneca* were published in quarto by Thomas Marsh in 1581, and were dedicated to 'Sir Thomas Henneage, Treasurer of the Queen's Chamber.' The volume included *Hercules Furens*, *Thyestes*, and *Troas*, translated by Jasper Heywood; *Hippolytus*, *Medea*, *Agamemnon*, and *Hercules Œtæus* by John Studley; *Thebais* by Thomas Newton; *Œdipus* by Alexander Neville, and *Octavia* by Thomas Nuce. It was published under the editorship of Thomas Newton, who had himself contributed the *Thebais*. Seven out of the ten plays had appeared previously. Heywood's *Troas* was published in octavo in 1559, and his *Thyestes*, also in octavo, in the next year. *Hercules Furens* appeared in octavo in 1561. Neville's *Œdipus* was written in 1560, and appeared in octavo in 1563, and Nuce's *Octavia* appeared in quarto in 1566. Studley's *Medea* and *Agamemnon* both appeared in octavo in 1566. The collected edition of 1581 was reprinted by the Spenser Society in 1887. The text of the 1581 quarto is, in the main, except for slight differences in spelling and punctuation, the same as that of the separate earlier editions, on which it is evidently based. It has, however, a considerable number of misprints, and when the two texts differ, the reading of the separate editions is generally to be preferred. The text of Neville's *Œdipus* in the 1581 quarto is not, however, a reprint of the octavo of 1563, but is an independent text, revised probably by Neville himself. New lines are inserted, and old ones re-written, so as to remove faults in the metre and rhyme.

Jasper Heywood was the younger son of John Heywood the epigrammatist. He was born in 1535, and sent to Oxford in 1547. In 1554 he was elected a probationer fellow of Merton College, but in 1558 he was obliged to resign, and late in the same year he was elected to a fellowship at All Souls'. It was whilst he was a fellow of All Souls' that he published his Senecan translations, which were the earliest to appear of the *Tenne Tragedies*. He was a Roman Catholic, and afterwards resigned his fellowship on account of his religion and left England.

In later life he returned to England as superior of the Jesuit mission, and was imprisoned for seventeen months. He died at Naples in 1598.

Heywood seems to have possessed more poetic feeling than any of his fellow-translators. I should unhesitatingly pronounce the *Troas* to be the finest piece of work among the *Tenne Tragedies*. Amid all the rant and fury of Hercules, Œdipus, Medea, and their companions, the scene between Andromache, her little son, and Ulysses in Act III of the *Troas* is conspicuous for its tenderness and pathos, and though this may be due in part to the fact that the play itself is one of Seneca's best, credit must be given to Heywood's judgment in selecting it for his first attempt. 'I have,' he says in his preface, 'privately taken the part which pleased me best of so excellent an author, for better is tyme spent in the best then other.'

Heywood's style is much more free from words of a colloquial, dialectal, or archaic character than that of Studley, Nuce, or Newton. His English is on the whole that of the ordinary Elizabethan translator, though he has some striking Latinisms, such as 'freate,' 'frete' = 'sea' (Lat. *fretum*), and 'roge' = 'funeral pyre' (Lat. *rogus*), which in one passage (*Troas*, I, 81 (99 a)) has been misunderstood by the printer and appears as 'rage.'

It is interesting to note the change in Heywood's attitude as a translator towards his original. In the *Troas*, the earliest of his three translations, he dealt with it very freely, adding a chorus of sixty lines of his own invention at the end of Act I, a new scene consisting of a speech of ninety-one lines by the ghost of Achilles at the beginning of Act II, and three additional stanzas at the end of the chorus which concludes Act II. He also substituted a chorus of his own for the Senecan chorus at the close of Act III. In his preface 'To the Reader' in the edition of 1559, Heywood speaks of these alterations in the following terms:

> Now as concerninge sondrye places augmented and some altered in this my translation. First forasmuch as this worke seemed unto mee in some places unperfite, whether left so of the Author, or parte of it loste, as tyme devoureth all things, I wot not, I have (where I thought good) with addition of myne owne Penne supplied the wante of some thynges, as the firste Chorus, after the fyrste acte...Also in the seconde Acte I have added the Speache of Achilles Spright, rysing from Hell to require the Sacrifyce of Polyxena...Agayne the three laste staves of the Chorus after the same Acte: and as for the thyrde Chorus which in Seneca beginneth thus, Que vocat sedes? For as much as nothing is therein but a heaped number of farre and straunge Countries, considerynge with my selfe, that the names of so manye unknowen Countreyes, Mountaynes, Desertes, and Woodes, shoulde have no grace in the Englishe tounge, but bee a straunge and unpleasant thinge to the Readers (excepte I should expound the Historyes of each one, which would be farre to tedious,) I have in the place thereof made another beginninge in this

manner. O Iove that leadst, etc. Which alteration may be borne withall, seynge that Chorus is no part of the substaunce of the matter. In the rest I have for my slender learninge endevored to keepe touch with the Latten, not worde for worde or verse for verse, as to expounde it, but neglectynge the placinge of the wordes, observed their sence.

In the *Thyestes* Heywood has only added one original speech, the soliloquy of Thyestes at the close of the play, in which the unhappy father invokes on himself all the torments of hell.

In the *Hercules Furens*, published in 1561, there is no addition of original matter, and it is clear from the character of the translation itself that Heywood no longer 'endevored to keepe touch with the Latten, not worde for worde or verse for verse, but neglectynge the placinge of the wordes, observed their sence,' but that his aim was to reproduce the Latin much more closely. On the title-page he states, first in Latin, then in English, that the tragedy is 'newly perused and of all faultes whereof it did before abound diligently corrected, and for the profit of young schollers so faithfully translated into English metre, that ye may se verse for verse tourned as farre as the phrase of the English permitteth.'

It may be doubted whether this change in Heywood's method of translation was really beneficial to his work. In striving to keep the Latin order of words, his English becomes clumsy and frequently obscure, *e.g.*, *Herc. Fur.*, II, 43, 44 (5 a)[1]:

> Nor handes that well durst enterprise his noble travayles all
> The filthy labour made to shrynke of foul Augias hall,

where 'labour' is the nominative, and 'handes' the accusative. Or *Herc. Fur.*, III, 251—254 (13 a):

> As great as when comes hour of longer night,
> And willing quiet sleepes to be extent,
> Holds equall Libra Phoebus Chariots light,
> A sorte the secrete Ceres doe frequent,

where the meaning is difficult to grasp without the Latin:

> quanta, cum longae redit hora nocti
> crescere et somnos cupiens quietos
> Libra Phoebeos tenet aequa currus,
> turba secretam Cererem frequentat.

The attempt to reproduce exactly Latin constructions is not always very happy, *e.g.*, *Herc. Fur.*, II, 82—84:

> ...and beaten with thy stroake
> The mount, now here, now there fell downe: and rampier rente of stay,
> The raging brooke of Thessaly did roon a newe found way

[1] All quotations are taken from the quarto edition of 1581. The references in brackets are to the pages of that edition.

where the last clause is an attempt to follow the Latin:

> et rupto aggere
> nova cucurrit Thessalus torrens via;

and *Herc. Fur.*, II, 182, 183 (7 a):

> ...what should I the mothers speake
> Both suffring, and adventring gyltes?

which represents the Latin:

> ...quid matres loquar
> passas et ausas scelera?

and *Herc. Fur.*, III, 308, 309 (14 a):

> Hee over Foordes of Tartare brought
> Returnde appeased beeinge Hell,

which represents:

> Transvectus vada Tartari
> pacatis redit inferis.

This close attention to the construction of the original has influenced Heywood's metre, for the attempt to represent one Latin line by one English, whilst keeping the Latin order of words, has resulted in much enjambement, and in a consequent placing of the caesura earlier in the line than is its normal position. One passage from Megara's speech at the beginning of Act II (II, 3—10 (4 b)) will illustrate this:

> ...To mee yet never day
> Hath careles shin'de: the ende of one affliction past away
> Beginning of an other is: an other ennemy
> Is forthwith founde, before that hee his joyfull family
> Retourne unto, an other fyght hee taketh by behest:
> Nor any respite given is to him nor quiet rest:
> But whyle that he commaunded is: straight him pursueth shee
> The hatefull Iuno.

The extent of the alteration produced in Heywood's rhythm may be gauged from the different proportion of lines with the main pause after the second or third foot to be found in the *Hercules Furens* as compared with the *Troas*. Metrically, the ear requires the caesura after the fourth foot, and there is usually a slight pause at that place, but the main pause (or, as it may be called, the logical caesura as distinct from the metrical) often occurs earlier in the line, and in the *Troas* the proportion of lines in which it is to be found after the second foot is under six per cent of the total number of fourteeners, whilst in the *Hercules Furens* it is over twenty-two per cent. Again, in the *Troas* the number of lines with the logical caesura after the third foot is

under two per cent, whilst in the *Hercules Furens* it is over six per cent. Thus in the latter play, the number of normal lines in which the logical and metrical caesuras coincide in falling after the fourth foot, has enormously decreased.

John Studley, unlike Heywood, but like Neville and Nuce, was a Cambridge scholar. The date of his birth is not certain, but it must have been about 1545. He came up to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1561, and took his B.A. in 1566 and M.A. in 1570, being elected to a fellowship in the interval between the two degrees. His *Agamemnon* and *Medea* were published in 1566, the year in which he took his B.A. In the Stationers' Register for 1566–67 there is also an entry 'Recevyd of Henry Denham for his lycense for ye pryntinge of the iiijth parte of Senecas Workes,' and it has been conjectured that this was Studley's translation of the *Hippolytus*—the fourth and 'most ruthful tragedy' as it is called in the 1581 edition—though no copy of this separate edition is extant. The date of Studley's translation of the *Hercules Œtaeus* is not known.

Studley's poetical style differs widely from that of Heywood. The diction of his four translations is extremely interesting; there is a homely and popular character about it which is quite foreign to Heywood's, though we find it again in some measure in Newton's *Thebais*, included among the *Tenne Tragedies*. Studley appears to have had very little sense of humour, and he frequently falls into bathos exactly in the passages where he wishes to be impressive, but there is an extraordinary amount of vigour in his style. It seems sometimes as if the mantle of the old alliterative poets had fallen upon him; he has the same love of heaped-up epithets, the same affection for redundancy, the same delight in alliteration.

His metre is worthy of notice on one or two points. He employs the fourteener, the decasyllable rhyming alternately (which cannot be called the heroic or elegiac quatrain in this case, for there is no pause at the end of the quatrain), the alexandrine, and the 'poulter's measure,' being the only one of the translators to attempt the two latter metres. His success, especially with the fourteener and the decasyllable, which are his favourite metres, is not very remarkable, and it may be doubted whether his ear was not sometimes at fault. One or two examples may be given of the effect produced by his curious handling of the caesura in the fourteener:

> The ruthfull ruin of our natyve countrey wee behelde.
> *Ag.*, III, 270 (152 a).

> Nor as it were with Osir hill that cloven were in twayne
> Nor with the sway of all the mountayne falling am I slayne
> *Herc. Œt.*, IV, 42, 43 (206 a);

and one or two examples also of his use of extra unstressed syllables:

> Among the vulgar sorte, another in private simple bowers.
> *Ag.*, II, 225 (146 a).

> My corpulent Carkas is consumde of Hercules every lim.
> *Herc. Œt.* IV, 118 (207 a).

> Why dost thou slake thy frying fits? this mallady still survive.
> *Herc. Œt.* II, 99 (193 b).

> Doth heare the noyse whyle Hercules with mettall of yellow hew.
> *Ag.*, IV, 74 (155 b).

Studley sometimes employs a feminine ending to the fourteener, with not very striking success, *e.g.*,

> I render you to tyrants kings, bugges, beasts, and grysely divells
> By taking him away that should revenge you of these evilles.
> *Herc. Œt.*, III, 174, 175 (201 b, 202 a).

> When of her deare and tender brattes she wholly was bereven
> And did bewayle with strayned sighes her children seven and seven.
> *Herc. Œt.*, V, 267, 268 (216 a).

The ten-syllable line did not always fare very well in Studley's hands. I give one example from a Chorus containing many irregularities, but too long to be quoted in full:

> Wee stand not in our razed countrey wall,
> Whose ground shall now bee overgrowne (alas)
> With bramble, and bryer, and down the temples fall:
> While mucky sheepecotes are planted in their place.
> *Herc. Œt.*, I, 151—154 (190 a).

Studley's dramatic powers and his sense of poetic fitness do not seem to have been of a high order. His translations offer more examples of bathos than any of the others included in the *Tenne Tragedies*. It is difficult to make a selection where the choice is so wide, but the following lines may be quoted from Cassandra's vision of the murder of Agamemnon (*Ag.*, V, 15—26 (156 a)):

> The King in gorgyous royall robes on chayre of State doth sit,
> And pranckt with pryde of Pryams pomp of whom he conquerd it.
> Put of this hostile weede, to him (the Queene, his Wyfe gan say,)
> And of thy loving Lady wrought weare rather thys aray.
> This garment knit. It makes mee loth, that shivering heere I stande.
> O shall a King be murthered, by a banisht wretches hande?
> Out, shall th'adulterer destroy the husbande of the Wyfe?
> The dreadfull destinies approcht, the foode that last in lyfe
> He tasted of before his death, theyr maysters bloud shall see,
> The gubs of bloude downe dropping on the wynde shall powred bee.
> By trayterous tricke of trapping weede his death is brought about,
> Which being put upon his heade his handes coulde not get out.

After an interview with Jason, Medea is made to say:

> What is he slily slypt and gon? falles out the matter so?
> O Iason dost thou sneake away, not having minde of mee,
> Nor of those former great good turnes that I have done for thee?
> *Medea*, III, 273—275 (131 a).

Hercules, when recalling his former prowess, exclaims:

> I that returnde from dennes of death, and Stigian streame defyed
> And ferryed over Lethes lake, and dragd up, chaind, and tyde
> The tryple headded mastiffe hownd, when Tytans teeme did start
> So at the ougly sight that he fel almost from his cart.
> *Herc. Œt.*, IV, 34—37 (206 a).

It seems unkind to dwell on Studley's poetical failings. He is certainly no great poet, but occasionally he has some fine lines. In the last scene of the *Hippolytus* the Chorus says (*Hipp.* V, 116 (74 b)):

> O Theseus to thy plaint eternall tyme is graunted thee,

and there is pathos in Theseus' cry over the dead body of his son:

> Lo I enioy my fathers gift, O solitarinesse.

Such lines however are rare, and the chief attractions of Studley's verse seem to be its quaintness and its exuberance. Both these qualities have been exemplified in the quotations already given, but one quotation more may be adduced, from the description of Medea practising her magic arts:

> She mumbling coniures up by names of ills the rable rout,
> In hugger mugger cowched long, kept close, unserched out:
> All pestlent plagues she calles upon, what ever Libie lande,
> In frothy boyling stream doth worke, or muddy belching sande:
> What tearing torrents Taurus breedes, with snowes unthawed still
> Where winter flawes, and hory frost knit hard the craggy hill,
> She layes her crossing hands upon each monstrous coniurde thing,
> And over it her magicke verse with charming doth she sing:
> A mowsie, rowsie, rusty route with cancred Scales Iclad
> From musty, fusty, dusty dens where lurked long they had
> Doe craull...
> *Medea*, IV, 15—25 (133 a).

With regard to Studley's treatment of his original, it may be noted that in no play has he made such extensive alterations as were effected by Heywood in the *Troas*, whilst on the other hand he nowhere follows the Latin as closely as Heywood does in the *Hercules Furens*. His chief additions of original matter are in the *Medea*, I, 97—172 (121—122 a), where he substitutes a Chorus of his own for the Senecan Chorus, the *Agamemnon* (V, 185—256 (159 b—160 b)), where he adds a speech by Eurybates in which the death of Cassandra, the flight of Orestes, and the imprisonment of Electra are narrated, and the

Hippolytus (v, 25—44 (73 b)), where he introduces a curious passage in which Phaedra implores the spirit of Hippolytus to take her living body in exchange for his own mutilated corpse.

In general, Studley follows the meaning of the Latin fairly closely, but does not try to reproduce the Latin order as Heywood does, and he frequently expands, and explains wherever he considers it necessary, *e.g.*, where Seneca makes Medea say of Jason:

> merita contempsit mea
> qui scelere flammas viderat vinci et mare?

Studley has (*Medea* II, 7—14 (122 a)):

> O hath he such a stony heart, that doth no more esteeme,
> The great good turnes, and benefits that I imployde on him?
> Who knowes that I have lewdly used enchauntments for his sake,
> The rigour rough, and stormy rage, of swelling Seas to slake.
> The grunting firy foming Bulles, whose smoking guts were stuft,
> With smoltring fumes, that from theyr Iawes, and Nosthrils out they puft.
> I stopt their gnashing mounching mouths, I quencht their burning breath,
> And vapors hot of stewing paunch, that els had wrought his death.

In one or two cases it seems evident that Studley has mistranslated the Latin through haste or carelessness, *e.g.*, in *Ag.*, III, 17, 18 (149 a) he translates Seneca's:

> tu pande vivat coniugis frater mei
> et pande teneat quas soror sedes mea

by:

> Declare if that my brothers wyfe enioy the vytall ayre
> And tel me to what kind of Coast my sister doth repayre.

In *Herc. Œt.*, III, 188 (202 a):

> Nocens videri qui petit mortem cupit

is represented by:

> He doth condemne himselfe to dye that needes wil guylty seeme.

Alexander Neville was born in 1544, and translated the *Œdipus* in his sixteenth year, according to his preface to Dr Wotton. He was acquainted with George Gascoigne, and was one of the five friends whom Gascoigne describes as challenging him to write poems on Latin mottoes proposed by themselves. He became secretary to Archbishop Parker, and remained in the service of Parker's successors, Grindal and Whitgift. In 1575 he published a Latin account of Kett's rebellion of 1549, and in 1587 there appeared *Academiae Cantabrigiensis lacrymae tumulo...P. Sidneii sacratae per A. Nevillum.*

The *Œdipus* is a creditable performance, considering the translator's youth, but it is difficult to agree with Warton's judgment in his description of the *Tenne Tragedies*, quoted at the beginning of the Spenser Society's reprint of 1881, that 'it is by far the most spirited and elegant version in the whole collection, and it is to be regretted that he did not undertake all the rest.' It does not show any striking marks of poetic power, and in places the metre is very faulty. Neville has a tendency to expand his original in the non-choric portions, and to add unnecessary reflections. Thus he enlarges Œdipus' last speech (*Œd.*, v, 194—246 (94 a)) from 20 lines to 52 by making such additions as the following:

> O Œdipus accursed wretch, lament thine owne Calamity,
> Lament thy state, thy griefe lament, thou Caitife borne to misery.
> Where wilt thou now become (alas?) thy Face where wilt thou hyde:
> O myserable Slave, canst thou such shamefull tormentes byde?

After the messenger's description, a little earlier in the same act, of Œdipus' despair and plucking out of his eyes, Neville puts these moral lines into the messenger's mouth:

> Beware betimes, by him beware, I speake unto you all.
> Learne Justice, truth, and feare of God by his unhappy fall.
> *Œd.*, v, 99, 100 (92 b).

In the choruses Neville has made considerable alterations. He has expanded the chorus in the first act from ninety-two lines to a hundred and seventeen, whilst he has entirely omitted the chorus of a hundred and six lines in praise of Bacchus at the close of Act II. He has replaced the chorus of fifty-five lines in Act III by a new chorus of twenty-two lines dealing with a different subject, and similarly in Act IV has substituted a short original chorus of fourteen lines for the Senecan one of thirty lines. The chorus in Act V is substantially the same as Seneca's, though Neville, who has a liking for moral maxims, adds four lines quite in the Senecan manner:

> And thou that subject art to death. Regard thy latter day.
> Thinke no man blest before his ende. Advise thee well and stay.
> Be sure his lyfe, and death, and all, be quight exempt from mysery:
> Ere thou do once presume to say: this man is blest and happy.
> *Œd.*, v, 118—121 (92 b).

Thomas Nuce or Newce, as his name is sometimes spelt, was in 1562 a fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge. He was afterwards rector of Cley in Norfolk, and held several other livings before his death in 1617. The hundred and seventy lines of English verse prefixed to the 1566 edition of Studley's *Agamemnon* were written by

Nuce, whose *Octavia* appeared in the same year. The *Octavia* is an interesting play, both for its metre and language. Unlike the rest of the *Tenne Tragedies*, it does not employ the fourteener at all. Nuce apparently perceived that the fourteener was by no means an ideal metre for tragedy, and he had the courage to discard it, and to use in its place the five-foot or decasyllabic line rhyming in couplets, occasionally in triplets, and the octosyllable rhyming alternately. In Nuce's hands, as in those of other Elizabethans, the decasyllabic couplet produces a totally different effect from the 'heroic couplet' of Dryden and Pope, though it is identically the same in structure, except that it has no regular pause at the close of the couplet. A passage from *Oct.*, I, 55—67 (162 b) will illustrate Nuce's use of this metre:

> Lo see of late the great and mighty stocke,
> By lurking Fortunes sodayne forced knocke,
> Of Claudius quite subvert and cleane extinct:
> Tofore, who held the world in his precinct;
> The Brittayne Ocean coast that long was free,
> He ruld at wil, and made it to agree,
> Their Romaine Gallies great for to embrace.
> Lo, he that Tanais people first did chase,
> And Seas unknowen to any Romayne wight
> With lusty sheering shippes did overdight,
> And safe amid the savage freakes did fight,
> And ruffling surging seas hath nothing dread,
> By cruel spouses gilt doth lye all dead.

The following passage illustrates Nuce's use of the octosyllable (*Oct.*, I, 574—581 (171 a)):

> The flasshing flawes do flappe her face,
> And on her speaking mouth do beate,
> Anone shee sinkes a certayne space,
> Depressed downe with surges great:
> Anone shee fleetes on weltring brim,
> And pattes them of with tender handes
> Through faynting feare then taught to swim
> Approaching death, and fates withstandes.

Nuce's language, as will be seen from these extracts, differs somewhat both from Heywood's and from Studley's. It has fewer Latinisms than Heywood's, and is slightly less colloquial and more archaic than Studley's. Nuce has a partiality for archaic words like 'freake,' and 'make' (meaning 'spouse'), which the other translators neglect, and he employs very largely the prefix y- before the past participle and sometimes before other parts of the verb.

Nuce follows the Latin fairly closely, though he makes no attempt to reproduce the Latin order, as Heywood does in the *Hercules Furens*. He has no additions of original matter of any length, and he does not

abridge or alter the choruses, as Neville does. The opening lines of the play may be taken as an example of his method of translation:

> Now that Aurore with glitteryng streames,
> The glading starres from skye doth chase,
> Syr Phœbus pert, with spouting beames,
> From dewy neast doth mount apace:
> And with his cheerefull lookes doth yeeld,
> Unto the world a gladsome day.
> *Oct.*, I, 1—6 (161 b).

The Latin is:

> Iam vaga caelo sidera fulgens
> Aurora fugat,
> surgit Titan radiante coma
> mundoque diem reddit clarum.

Occasionally, however, Nuce deals with his original much more freely, *e.g.*, *Oct.*, II, 137—139 (174 a):

> *Ner.* If that I were a meacocke or a slouch
> Each stubborne, clubbish daw would make mee couch.
> *Sen.* And whom they hate, with force they overquell,

which represents the Latin:

> *Ner.* Calcat iacentem vulgus. *Sen.* Invisum opprimet.

Thomas Newton, the editor of the 1581 edition of the *Tenne Tragedies*, and the translator of the *Thebais*, was born about 1542, and went to Trinity College, Oxford, which he left for a time to study at Queens' College, Cambridge, though he afterwards returned to his old college at Oxford. About 1583 he became rector of Little Ilford, Essex. He wrote books on historical, medical, and theological subjects, and made several translations from Latin. He translated the *Thebais* in order to make the 1581 volume complete. It is somewhat difficult to judge of his poetical powers from this play, since he undertook it from necessity and not from choice. It is no wonder that the other translators of Seneca had let it alone, for it is not a single complete play, but consists, apparently, of two fragments of plays on the Œdipus legend—the first fragment being an intolerably wearisome dialogue between Œdipus and Antigone, in which Œdipus expresses his determination to die and Antigone dissuades him, whilst the second deals with the strife between the two sons of Œdipus, and Jocasta's efforts to reconcile them. The dialogue between Œdipus and Antigone occupies in Seneca about 320 lines, which Newton expands into 500, all in the fourteener measure. The weary reader can only wish that Œdipus, who is continually announcing that he means to kill himself by some

horrible death, would really put his intentions into practice instead of describing so minutely the tortures he wishes to inflict on himself, or dwelling with such insistence on the crimes he has unwittingly committed, which render him worthy of death in his own eyes.

It was impossible for Newton to make much of such dramatically unpromising material without cutting it down mercilessly, but he does not seem to have felt that his original needed compression. On the contrary, he has a tendency to expand the Latin considerably, and to insert explanatory remarks which, though useful doubtless to the reader unlearned in classical story, scarcely add to the dramatic effect. He is not a slavish translator by any means; his rendering is often very free, but unfortunately he never seems to have noticed that his original needed not expansion but compression. Two examples will illustrate this. Seneca makes Œdipus say:

> quantulum hac egi manu?
> non video noxae conscium nostrae diem
> sed videor.

Newton expands this to the following (*Theb.*, I, 11—16 (41 a)):

> Alas, what litle triffling tricke hath hitherto bene wrought
> By these my hands? what feate of worth or maistry have I sought?
> Indeede, they have me helpt to pull myne eyes out of my head:
> So that ne Sunne, ne Moone I see, but life in darknesse lead.
> And though that I can nothing see, yet is my guilt and cryme
> Both seene and knowne, and poyncted at, (woe worth the cursed tyme).

Again Seneca has (ll. 40—43):

> sequor, sequor, iam parce. sanguineum gerens
> insigne regni Laius rapti furit;
> en ecce, inanes manibus infestis petit
> foditque vultus. nata, genitorem vides?

which Newton expands thus (*Theb.*, I, 63—72 (41 b, 42 a)):

> O Father myne I come, I come, now father ceasse thy rage:
> I know (alas) how I abus'd my Fathers hoary age:
> Who had to name King Laius: how hee doth fret and frye
> To see such lewd disparagement: and none to blame but I.
> Whereby the Crowne usurped is, and he by murther slayne
> And Bastardly incestuous broode in Kingly throne remayne.
> And loe, dost thou not playnly see, how he my panting Ghost
> With raking pawes doth hale and pull, which grieves my conscience most?
> Dost thou not see how he my face bescratcheth tyrant wyse?
> Tel mee (my Daughter) hast thou seene Ghostes in such griesly guyse!

Newton's language has considerable affinity with that used by Studley. It has a distinctly colloquial character in many places, is less dignified than Heywood's, and prefers native words to Latinisms.

A striking example of Newton's employment of colloquialisms may be found in Polynices' speech in Act IV, ll. 243—256 (53 a):

> But tell mee whyther shall I goe? Assigne mee to some place:
> Bylike, you would that brother myne should still with shamelesse face
> Possesse my stately Pallaces, and revell in his ruffe,
> And I thereat to holde my peace, and not a whit to snuffe,
> But like a Countrey Mome to dwell in some poore thatched Cot:
> Allow mee poore Exyle such one: I rest content, God wot.
> You know, such Noddyes as I am, are woont to make exchaung
> Of Kingdomes, for poore thatched Cots, beelike this is not straung.
> Yea more: I, matcht now to a Wyfe of noble ligne and race
> Shall like a seely Dottipoll live there in servile case,
> At becke and checke of queenely Wyfe, and like a kitchen drudge
> Shall at Adrastus lordly heeles, (my Wyves owne Father) trudge.
> From Princely Port to tumble downe into poore servile state,
> Is greatest griefe that may betyde by doome of frouncing fate.

In metre, Newton has followed Heywood's example rather than Studley's. He uses enjambement freely, places the logical caesura very frequently at the end of the second foot, and has a higher percentage of lines with the logical caesura after the fifth syllable (*i.e.*, a caesura of the lyric kind) than Heywood himself—the proportion being under three per cent in all Heywood's plays, whilst it is over three per cent in the *Thebais*. As an example of Newton's use of enjambement, *Theb.*, I, 385—390 (45 b and 46 a) may be taken:

> Apollo by his Oracle pronounced sentence dyre
> Upon mee being yet unborne, that I unto my Syre
> Should beastly parricide commit: and thereupon was I
> Condemmed straight by Fathers doome. My Feete were by and by
> Launcde through and through with yron Pins: hangde was I by y^e^ Heeles
> Upon a Tree: my swelling plants the printe thereof yet feeles.

Accidence.

As regards the accidence of the *Tenne Tragedies*, the verbal forms are the most noteworthy.

Present indicative, 2nd pers. sg.

The usual form is the normal one in -est, -st, but there are several examples of the form in -es, -s, *e.g.*:

> Thou beares as big and boystrous brawnes as Hercules.
> *Hipp.*, II, 502 (67 a).

See also *Hipp.*, III, 99 (69 a), *Herc. Œt.*, II, 261 (195 b), III, 241 (202 b), *Œd*, II, 62 (82 b), *Theb.*, I, 221 (43 b), *Oct.*, IV, 240 (184 b).

3rd pers. pl.

The usual form is the uninflected one, but all the translators have examples of the form in -s, *e.g.*:

> The Thracian Daughters wayls Eurydicen
> (Latin: deflent Eurydicen Threiciae nurus).
> *Herc. Fur.*, II, 376 (9 b).

> A kindred in whose cancred heartes olde privy grudges springes.
> *Ag.*, III, 403 (154 a).

See also *Medea*, IV, 259 (136 a), *Herc. Œt.*, I, 225 (191 a), IV, 254 (208 b), *Ag.*, II, 49 (143 b), III, 433 (154 a), *Troas*, I, 20 (98 b), *Œd.*, I, 209 (80 b), IV, 152 (91 a), *Oct.*, IV, 3 (180 b), *Theb.*, I, 16 (50 a).

The form in -eth, -th is also used by all the translators, *e.g.*:

> But loe two shining Sunnes at once in heaven appeareth bryght.
> *Ag.*, III, 398 (154 a).

> The misteries whereof the hearers understandeth not.
> *Theb.*, I, 216 (43 b).

See *Troas*, I, 187 (101 a), *Herc. Fur.*, III, 57 (10 b), *Hipp.*, I, 221 (59 a), *Medea*, IV, 256 (136 a), *Œd.*, IV, 97 (92 b), *Oct.*, II, 190 (175 a), etc.

The form in -n is also found, though rarely, *e.g.*:

> By al my Countrey Gods that bene in Temples closely kept.
> *Œd.*, II, 91 (82 b).

> Except they shed her bloud before they gone.
> *Troas*, Arg., 68 (97 b).

See *Œd.*, V, 115 (92 b), V, 245 (94 b).

Past participle.

The prefix y- (O.E. ge-) is used very frequently by Nuce, who has a love of archaic forms, and occasionally by the other translators.

See *Troas*, V, 24 (117 b), *Medea*, II, 38 (123 b), *Oct.*, I, 273 (166 a).

Weak past participles often omit final -ed, especially if the stem of the verb ends in t or d, *e.g.*: 'Thy fall hath lift thee higher up.' *Troas*, IV, 29 (114 b).

Strong past participles sometimes omit final -n, *e.g.*: 'This wayward agony hath take his perfit wits away.' *Herc. Œt.*, IV, 299 (209 b).

Preterite forms are sometimes found in the past participle, *e.g.*: 'I have shooke the seas.' *Herc. Œt.*, II, 271 (195 b).

Preterite.

Among the archaic or irregular forms used in the preterite are the following: 'Flang' = 'flung' (*Hipp.*, IV, 103 (71 b)), 'hard' = 'heard' (*Troas*, II, 101 (103 b)), 'molt' = 'melted' (*Herc. Œt.*, II, 533 (199 a)),

'mought' = 'might' (*Thy.*, III, 39 (28 a)), 'shakte' = 'shook' (*Oct.*, IV, 61 (181 b)), 'stack' = 'stuck' (*Medea*, IV, 156 (135 a)), 'yode' = 'went' (*Oct.*, I, 587 (171 a)).

METRE.

The metre used, as a rule, throughout the non-choric portions of the *Tenne Tragedies* (with the exception of Nuce's *Octavia*) is the fourteen syllable line or fourteener, with the normal structure:

× ⏑ × ⏑ × ⏑ × ⏑ ‖ × ⏑ × ⏑ × ⏑

(× representing an unstressed syllable, and ⏑ a stressed).

There are many deviations from this normal structure, and the most important may be grouped under the following heads:

(*a*) Shifting of the caesura.

(*b*) Inversion of the stress.

(*c*) Addition of extra unstressed syllables.

(*d*) Deficiency of unstressed syllables.

(*e*) Use of feminine, instead of masculine, rhyme.

With regard to (*a*) it may be observed that there is usually a pause, though sometimes one of the very slightest kind, after the fourth foot, even when the main pause is elsewhere. This explains the fact that the main pause is much more often to be found after the second foot than after the third, as when it occurs in the earlier position it is easy to effect a slight secondary pause after the fourth foot, as a sufficient interval has then elapsed.

There are, however, some examples in which it is impossible to make any pause after the fourth foot, *e.g.*:

> Why stay I wreche? Why doth this dreary deede make mee afright.
> *Herc. Œt.*, III, 135 (201 b).

> The certayne succour of a trusty friende I have espide.
> *Ag.*, V, 62 (157 a).

The caesura, whilst continuing to be of the masculine type, may be shifted to a position after the first, second, third, fifth or sixth foot[1]. The position after the second foot is especially favoured by Heywood (in the *Thyestes* and *Hercules Furens*) and by Newton. In the *Thyestes* the proportion of lines with the logical caesura in this position is as

[1] Since writing the above, I have discussed the metre of the *Tenne Tragedies* with Dr W. W. Greg, and have come to the conclusion that it would probably be better to treat the caesura of the fourteener as occupying a fixed position after the fourth foot, and to consider lines in which it is impossible to make a break there as lacking in caesura rather than as shewing shifting of caesura.

high as twenty-nine per cent. The position after the first foot is rare, and after the sixth foot very rare.

The caesura may also be of the feminine lyric type, *i.e.*, it may fall after an unaccented syllable which is reckoned in the scansion, *e.g.*:

> And easde his shoulder from the burthen of his quiver light.
> *Herc. Œt.*, III, 78 (200 b).

This caesura is found after the third, fifth, seventh, ninth, or eleventh syllable.

Finally the caesura may be of the feminine epic type, *i.e.*, it may fall after an unaccented syllable which is not reckoned in the scansion, *e.g.*:

> Death is not sawst with soppes of Sorrow if some man els I have.
> *Ag.*, II, 141 (145 a).

There are a few exceptions to the statement that the fourteener is used throughout the non-choric portions (except in Nuce's *Octavia*). The most important of these passages are the scene between Hecuba and the Chorus in *Troas*, I, 71—170 (99 a—100 b), the speech of Andromache to Astyanax in *Troas*, III, 301—337 (111 b—112 a), and the soliloquy of Thyestes in *Thy.*, V, 35—84 (36 a and b)—all in the ten-syllable line rhyming alternately; the speech of Achilles in *Troas*, II, 1—91 (101 b—103 a) in rhyme royal; and the soliloquy of Iole in *Herc. Œt.*, I, 222—277 (191 a—192 a) in the mixed fourteeners and alexandrines known as poulter's measure or common measure. In Nuce's *Octavia* the decasyllabic couplet, and the octosyllable rhyming alternately are used in the non-choric portions.

In the Chorus of the various translations the following metres are used: the fourteener; the poulter's measure; the alexandrine; the ten-syllable line, rhyming alternately, or arranged in stanzas of six lines rhyming a b a b c c, or in stanzas of seven lines rhyming a b a b b c c (rhyme royal); the octosyllable rhyming alternately.

The ten-syllable line rhyming alternately is the favourite metre for the Chorus. Its structure and arrangement of rhyme are the same as those of the heroic or elegiac quatrain (used in Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis* and Gray's *Elegy*), but there is no definite pause at the close of the quatrain.

Vocabulary.

The question of language or vocabulary has already been touched upon in the discussion of the styles of the different translators. It will be seen from those references that the language used by each translator differs somewhat from that of the others. Heywood's language is

marked by occasional Latinisms, Studley's by colloquialisms, Nuce's by archaisms.

There are a very large number of interesting words employed in the *Tenne Tragedies*, and it will only be possible to give a few specimens.

Latinisms.

'Frete' or 'freate,' meaning 'sea' or 'flood' (Lat. 'fretum'), *e.g.*:

> And freate that twyse with ebbe away doth slip,
> And twyse upflowe. *Herc. Fur.*, II, 117, 118 (6 a).
>
> And hardned top of frosen freate hee troade,
> And sylent Sea with bankes full dumme about.
> *Herc. Fur.*, II, 331, 332 (9 a).
>
> Thou fearefull freate of fyre...
> O Phlegethon. *Thy.*, V, 270, 271 (39 b).

The *New Eng. Dict.* gives only 'strait' as the meaning of 'fret' or 'frete,' and gives one sixteenth century example of its use in that sense, but the meaning in the *Tenne Tragedies* seems to be wider and to correspond to the use of 'fretum' in Latin poetry to mean not merely 'strait' but 'sea.'

'Roge,' meaning 'funeral pile' (Lat. 'rogus'), *e.g.*:

> And roges for kings, that high on piles we reare.
> *Troas*, I, 145 (100 a).
>
> What bretherns double tentes? or what as many roages also?
> (Latin: quid totidem rogos?) *Herc. Fur.*, II, 185 (7 a).

'Impery,' meaning 'dominion' (Lat. 'imperium'), *e.g.*:

> ...the auncient note and sygne of impery. *Thy.*, II, 48 (24 b).

and also meaning a 'command,' *e.g.*, 'at ease he doth myne imperies fulfyl' (Lat. 'laetus imperia excipit') (*Herc. Fur.*, I, 40 (1 b)).

'Stadie,' meaning 'a race-course,' 'stadium,' *e.g.* 'Renowned stadies to my youth' (Lat. 'celebrata inveni stadia') (*Thy.*, III, 6 (27 b)).

Rare or difficult words.

'Marble' is used repeatedly by Studley as an epithet to be applied to the sea or sky, *e.g.*, *Hipp.*, I, 25 (56 a) 'Whereas the marble Sea doth fleete,' *Herc. Œt.*, II, 8 (192 a) '...when marble skies no filthy fog doth dim.' Readers of Milton will recall in this connection the 'pure marble air' of *Paradise Lost*, III, 564. The *New Eng. Dict.* explains 'marble' in the line just quoted from Milton, and in a line from Phaer 'marble-facyd seas,' as meaning 'smooth as marble,' and takes no notice of the use of the word in the *Tenne Tragedies*. A study of the passages in which the word is used by Studley and Heywood leads, however, to a somewhat different conclusion. In *Hipp.*, IV, 46 (71 a) we find 'A

boasting Bull his marble necke advaunced hye that bare' as the rendering of the Latin 'Caerulea taurus colla sublimis gerens,' where 'marble' represents the Latin 'caerulea.'

In *Hipp.*, v, 5 (73 a) 'the Monstrous hags of Marble Seas' represent the 'monstra caerulei maris' of Seneca.

Herc. Œt., II, 64 (193 a) has 'The northern beare to Marble seas shall stoupe to quench his thyrst' as the rendering of 'Ursa pontum sicca caeruleum bibet.' In Heywood's *Herc. Fur.*, I, 131 (3 a) we find 'With marble horse now drawne' representing Seneca's 'iam caeruleis evectus equis.' Apparently the translator associated the idea of blueness with marble, for in *Hipp.*, II, 491 (66 b) 'lucebit Pario marmore clarius' is rendered by:

> The Marble blue in quarry pittes of Parius that doth lie,
> Beares not so brave a glimsyng glosse as pleasant seemes thy face.

If marble be taken as the equivalent of 'caeruleus' = 'azure,' 'dark blue,' the force of the epithet when applied to sea or sky becomes clear, and Studley's predilection for it (he uses it frequently when there is no corresponding Latin adjective at all) becomes easy to understand.

'Aleare.'

> O well was I, when as I lived a leare,
> Not in the barren balkes of fallow land.
> *Herc. Œt.*, I, 165, 166 (190 b).

> I spoylde thy father Hercules, this hand, this hand aleare
> Hath murdred him. *Herc. Œt.*, III, 291, 292 (203 a).

The only example of the word in the *New Eng. Dict.* is the latter one just quoted from *Herc. Œt.* The *New Eng. Dict.* explains: '? Fated. ? chance-directed,' and suggests as a derivation: '? ad Lat. āleāris, meaning "belonging to dice."' This explanation does not hold good for the former passage, of which no notice is taken in the *New Eng. Dict.* There is no corresponding Latin word in either passage—'felix incolui non steriles focos,' 'Herculem eripuit tibi haec, haec peremit dextra.' Both the meaning and the origin of the word are obscure. The *Eng. Dialect Dict.* gives 'aleare' as a provincial word used of waggons to mean 'empty, unladen.'

'Cloyne' = 'steal.'

> ...for feare least thou alone
> Should cloyne his Scepter from his hand. *Herc. Œt.*, v, 310 (216 b).

'Feltred' = 'matted,' 'tangled.'

> And griesly Plutoes filthy feltred denne. *Oct.*, I, 368 (167 a).

'Frounced' = 'wrinkled,' 'perverse.'

And settest out a forhead fayre where frounced mynd doth rest.
Hipp., III, 100 (69 a).

Thus starting still with frounced mynde she walters to and froe.
Medea, III, 9 (127 b).

The *New Eng. Dict.* gives no example of the figurative use of 'frounced,' except a nineteenth-century one from Saintsbury in quite a different sense, though it mentions that 'frounce' is used to mean 'to look angry,' which is not quite the same sense as here.

'Gnoffe' = 'churl.'

The covetous charle, the greedy gnoffe in deede.
Herc. Œt., II, 441 (198 a).

'Linne' = 'cease.'

...proceede, and never linne
To gash and cut my wezand pype. *Theb.*, I, 264, 265 (44 a).

'Meacock' = 'coward.'

Not lyke a Meycocke, cowardly at eche alarme to flee.
Theb., I, 312 (45 a).

If that I were a meacocke or a slouch
Each stubborne, clubbish daw would make mee couch.
Oct., II, 137, 138 (174 a).

'Overheel' = 'cover over.'

...the fielde
That all to spatterd lay with bloud, and bones quight overheelde.
Œd., I, 124 (79 b).

The *New Eng. Dict.* gives no example of the use of the word as late as the sixteenth century except by Scotch writers.

'Plaunch.'

Alas, each part of me with guilt is plaunch and overgrowne.
Theb., I, 260 (44 a).

The *New Eng. Dict.* gives no example of the use of 'plaunch' as an adjective. It explains the verb 'plaunch' as 'to cover with planks.'

'Royle.'

As a verb, = 'dance,' 'be merry.'

Let them in solempne Flockes goe royle. *Herc. Fur.*, III, 298 (14 a).

As a noun, = 'monster' (?).

That ugly Royle heere heates him selfe. *Hipp.*, IV, 71 (71 b).

These royles, that preasse to worrey mee. *Medea*, V, 124 (138 b).

'Royst' = 'swagger.'

Huff, royst it out couragiously. *Hipp.*, II, 102 (63 a).

'Yetling.'

...and all the wood that range with yetling noyse.
Herc. Œt., IV, 376 (210 b).

The Value of the 'Tenne Tragedies.'

In considering the value of these Elizabethan translations from Seneca, it is necessary to take into account both their intrinsic worth and also their influence on contemporary literature. As regards their intrinsic worth, that consists rather in the testimony they afford as to the grammar, metre, and vocabulary used by men of classical learning at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, than in any dramatic power displayed in them. From the dramatic point of view, these translations are almost worthless intrinsically. Seneca's plays are hardly drama at all in the true sense of the word. They show rhetoric, eloquence, and a facility for epigrams, but, in the main, have little action and less development of character. How utterly inferior Seneca shows himself to the Greek dramatists, when handling the same themes, is abundantly illustrated by the *Medea*. In certain other plays, *e.g.*, in the *Hippolytus*, Seneca has altered the story in such a way as to ruin completely its tragic beauty, but in the *Medea* he has followed Euripides almost exactly in the construction of the plot, and yet has contrived to vulgarise and degrade the whole conception. In the first scene Medea appears as almost a raving maniac, calling down vengeance on her husband, and her language is as wild and extravagant at the beginning of the play as at the end. There is none of the subtle development of character which we find in Euripides, who has shown us Medea as a woman whose latent barbaric instincts gradually assert themselves under the injuries heaped on her, till at last the loving wife and mother becomes the furious savage. In Euripides' play, she is by no means wholly horrible; at first we sympathize with her against her foes, and though at last we shudder at her crime, we feel that the guilt is Jason's as much, nay perhaps more, than hers. But in Seneca's play she awakens no sympathy, for she is nothing but a savage throughout, except perhaps in one interview with Jason. In the very first scene she announces her intention to murder her children, and thus the sense of gradually growing horror with which Euripides leads up to that

resolve, is entirely lost. The beautiful scene in which she suddenly bursts into tears before Jason over her children, is wanting in Seneca, and finally she kills the children on the stage before their father's eyes—a gratuitous piece of theatrical horror carefully avoided by Euripides. It can hardly be said that the Elizabethan translators show any greater sense of dramatic fitness than does Seneca himself; in fact they often accentuate his faults and obscure his merits. Seneca's speeches, though not well adapted to the characters in whose mouths they are put, are generally effective from a rhetorical point of view, containing much eloquence and many striking epigrams. Unfortunately Studley and his companions exaggerated Seneca's eloquence till it became mere rant, and elaborated and explained his epigrams till they lost all their point. Two examples will show the translators' tendency to exaggerate the violence of the original.

In the *Œdipus*, II, 935, 936, 945—948, Seneca writes:

> Haec fatus aptat impiam capulo manum
> ensemque ducit. 'itane?...
> ...Iterum vivere atque iterum mori
> liceat, renasci semper ut totiens nova
> supplicia pendas—utere ingenio, miser.'

The corresponding lines in Neville's translation are (*Œd.*, V, 35, 36 55—62 (91 b, 92 a)):

> With that his bloudy fatall Blade, from out his sheath he drawes.
> And lowd he rores, with thundring voice. Thou beast why dost thou pawse?
> ...O that I might a thousand times, my wretched lyfe renewe.
> O that I might revyve and dye by course in order dewe.
> Ten hundred thousand times and more: than should I vengeance take
> Upon this wretched head. Than I perhaps in part should make
> A meete amends in deede, for this my fowle and lothsome Sin.
> Than should the proofe of payne reprove the life that I live in.
> The choyse is in thy hand thou wretch, than use thine owne discretion.
> And finde a meanes, whereby thou maist come to extreame confusion.

Again, Seneca puts into Medea's mouth the words:

> pelle femineos metus
> et inhospitalem Caucasum mente indue.
> quodcumque vidit Pontus aut Phasis nefas,
> videbit Isthmos. effera ignota horrida,
> tremenda caelo pariter ac terris mala
> mens intus agitat.

This is rant enough surely, but Studley is determined to improve on his original. His version (*Medea*, I, 69—80 (120 b) is:

> Exile all foolysh Female feare, and pity from thy mynde,
> And as th' untamed Tygers use to rage and rave unkynde,
> That haunt the croking combrous Caves, and clumpred frosen clives,
> And craggy Rockes of Caucasus, whose bitter colde depryves

> The soyle of all Inhabitours, permit to lodge and rest,
> Such salvage brutish tyranny within thy brasen brest.
> What ever hurly burly wrought doth Phasis understand,
> What mighty monstrous bloudy feate I wrought by Sea or Land:
> The like in Corynth shal be seene in most outragious guise,
> Most hyddious, hatefull, horrible, to heare, or see wyth eyes,
> Most divelish, desperate, dreadfull deede, yet never knowne before,
> Whose rage shall force heaven, earth, and hell to quake and tremble sore.

Two examples will illustrate how much some of Seneca's concise and pointed lines lose in the translation. Seneca makes Creon say to Medea 'i, querere Colchis' (l. 197). Studley translates this by 'Avaunt, and yell out thy complaynts at Colchis, get thee hence' (*Medea*, II, 140 (124 a)). In *Herc. Œt.*, 641—642, where the Latin has two short lines:

> quos felices Cynthia vidit,
> vidit miseros enata dies,

the English has six long ones:

> Whom Moone at morne on top of Fortunes wheele
> High swayed hath seene, at fulnesse of renowne,
> The glading sunne hath seene his Scepter reele,
> And him from high fall topsey turvey downe.
> At morne full merry, blith, in happy plight,
> But whelmde in woes and brought to bale ere nyght.
>
> *Herc. Œt.*, II, 459—464 (198 a).

It is hardly necessary to multiply examples in order to prove how little share the *Tenne Tragedies* can claim of true dramatic quality. Their value lies elsewhere—in the interest of their language and style, in their metrical and grammatical forms, and in their influence on the development of the Elizabethan drama. I have dwelt already on their metre, grammar, and style, and on the extremely interesting character of their vocabulary. On all these points they are worthy, I believe, of careful study. With regard to their influence on the Elizabethan drama, the question is a wide one, and can only be touched on here very slightly.

Nash's well-known passage in his preface 'To the Gentlemen Students of both Universities' prefixed to Greene's *Menaphon* (published 1589) is worth quoting in this connection:

> It is a common practise now a daies amongst a sort of shifting companions, that runne through every arte and thrive by none, to leave the trade of Noverint, whereto they were borne, and busie themselves with the indevors of Art, that could scarcely latinize their necke-verse if they should have neede; yet English Seneca read by candle light yeeldes manie good sentences, as Bloud is a begger, and so foorth; and, if you intreate him faire in a frostie morning, he will affoord you whole Hamlets, I should say handfulls of tragical speaches. But O griefe! tempus edax rerum, what's that will last alwaies? The sea exhaled by droppes will in continuance be drie, and

Seneca let bloud line by line and page by page at length must needes die to our stage: which makes his famisht followers to imitate the Kidde in Æsop, who, enamored with the Foxes newfangles, forsooke all hopes of life to leape into a new occupation, and these men, renouncing all possibilities of credit or estimation, to intermeddle with Italian translations.

William Webbe in his *Discourse of English Poetrie* (1586) mentions 'the laudable Authors of Seneca in English,' and Francis Meres in *Palladis Tamia* (1598) says 'these versifiers for their learned translations are of good note among us, Phaer for Virgils Æneads, Golding for Ovid's Metamorphosis..., the translators of Senecaes Tragedies.'

The influence of Seneca on the Elizabethan drama was undoubtedly great (see J. W. Cunliffe, *Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*; R. Fischer, *Kunstentwicklung der englischen Tragödie*). It affected both the form and the substance of the drama. Among the different points relating to external form on which Elizabethan tragedy was influenced by Seneca may be noticed the division into five acts, and the introduction of the Chorus, as in *Gorboduc, The Misfortunes of Arthur, Catiline,* etc.

With regard to matter and treatment, Senecan influence was much more important. It was seen in the treatment of the supernatural, in the selection of horrible and sensational themes, in the tendency to long rhetorical and descriptive passages, in the use of stichomythia, in the introduction of moralising commonplaces, in the spirit of philosophic fatalism. All these points are strikingly exemplified in the *Tenne Tragedies,* and on all of them the debt of the Elizabethan drama to Seneca is a large one. Take but one example, the use of the supernatural. Seneca had neglected the Greek Olympic gods and had shown a great partiality for the infernal deities, for ghosts and witchcraft, and his translators seized on this with eagerness and even sought to improve on him, for whereas in the *Troas,* Seneca only narrates by a messenger that Achilles' ghost has risen to demand the slaughter of Polyxena, Heywood introduces a fresh scene in which Achilles' ghost rises on the stage and declaims a speech of ninety-one lines. Seneca's use of the ghost in the *Agamemnon* is specially noteworthy by reason of its resemblance to that of the ghost in *Hamlet.* At the beginning of the play the ghost of Thyestes rises and incites his son Ægisthus to revenge on Agamemnon, who is the son of Thyestes' brother Atreus, the foul wrongs inflicted on Thyestes by his brother. No further use is made of this motive in the play, but it was a suggestion full of possibilities, and it is worthy of note that the passage quoted above from Nash on the subject of the use made by playwrights of translations from Seneca

contains the earliest known reference to the pre-Shakespearian *Hamlet*, 'whole Hamlets, I should say handfulls, of tragicall speaches.'

Seneca's use of witchcraft and necromancy is very noticeable, *e.g.*, in the *Medea*, *Œdipus*, and *Hercules Œtaeus*. One hundred lines in Studley's translation are devoted to a description of Medea preparing her charms, and amongst them occur the following:

> Then having brought above the ground of Serpents all the rout,
> Of filthy weedes the ranckest bane shee pyckes, and gathers out,
> ...Shee chops the deadly hearbes, and wrings the squesed clottered bloud
> Of Serpentes out: and filthy byrdes of irkesome miry mud
> She tempers with the same and eake she brayes the heart of Owle
> Foreshewing death with glaring Eyes, and moaping Vysage foule.
>
> *Medea*, IV, 55, 56, 91—94 (133 b, 134 a).

It is difficult to distinguish how much of this debt of the Elizabethan dramatists to Seneca is due to the plays in the original, and how much to the translations. As Cunliffe observes, the more learned dramatists would not need the help of translations, whilst the less learned, who were glad of the aid afforded by Heywood and Studley, would prefer to disguise their obligations by not quoting verbatim. Undoubtedly the *Tenne Tragedies* must have done much to spread a general knowledge of Seneca, and to inspire interest in his treatment of the drama, and probably their influence was much greater than any examination merely of parallel passages in them and in Elizabethan plays would lead us to suspect. The contact with a form of drama so different from that of the native mysteries, moralities, and interludes was an inspiration and a help to the Elizabethan drama. It led to more regular construction, and opened up new possibilities of subject and treatment, whilst at the same time the very imperfections of the Senecan tragedy did good service by preventing an unduly close imitation. Had the masterpieces of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides become the models of Elizabethan playwrights, we might have lost our national drama, for the English genius is far removed from the Greek in character. As it was, when the Elizabethans had learnt what they could from Seneca, they realised the dramatic weakness of his tragedies and struck out a new line for themselves. It is curious to remember that only thirty years elapsed between the publication of even the earliest of these translations and that of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* and *Faustus*, and that within fifteen years of the appearance of the collected edition, Shakespeare had written *Romeo and Juliet*. It throws a light on the extraordinarily rapid development of the English drama in those thirty or forty years. It seems a far cry from the broken-backed lines, bombastic rhetoric, and

puppet figures of these Senecan translations to the perfect harmony of thought and expression, to the ageless and deathless creations of Shakespeare's plays, but great poets can never be isolated from their predecessors, and every one of the forces which had been at work in English literature had its part in the perfecting of the Elizabethan drama. Even Shakespeare might not have been quite himself as we know him, had it not been for the work of the obscure translators of Seneca.

EVELYN M. SPEARING.

CAMBRIDGE.

NOTE. The Spenser Society's edition of the *Tenne Tragedies* is now out of print. A new edition, by H. de Vocht, of Heywood's *Troas, Thyestes* and *Hercules Furens* is announced in Professor Bang's *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas,* and a similar edition, in the same series, of Studley's *Agamemnon, Medea, Hippolytus* and *Hercules Œtaeus* has been undertaken by the present writer.

'EL DÓMINE LUCAS' OF LOPE DE VEGA AND SOME RELATED PLAYS.

I.

In his prologue to this play, Lope offers a hint as to its origin. After having retouched late in life this product of his youthful genius, he dedicated it to his 'best friend,' Juan de Piña, with these words: 'While in the service of that most excellent gentleman, Don Antonio de Toledo y Beamonte, Duke of Alba, in the age which may be described as "the green springtime of my flowery years," I heard related a part of this story, to the beginnings of which I had been a witness, the sponsor for its truth, if truth it has, being a Valencian gentleman, Borja by name, in soul an Alexander and in valour of person a second Spanish Alcides. I took a liking to the incident for I already had one for the gentleman whom I mention, and I wrote it down in the style then in vogue. I found it on the present occasion begging alms like the rest, as broken and friendless as are wont to be those who set forth from their land as soldiers, with the fuss and feathers of young blood and return after many years with wooden legs, stumps of arms, lacking eyes, and with regimentals of uncertain hue. I endeavoured to correct it, and, for better or for worse, it goes into the world, bearing the name of my best friend. Many know that such your grace is, and it would be tiresome to make excuses for not offering you greater things, more worthy of your talent; but often men do not give those they love things of most price, but rather what they most esteem[1].'

The Valencian gentleman in question is, without much doubt, Lope's friend, Don Francisco de Borja, Prince of Esquilache, a native of Valencia, well-known as poet and viceroy of Peru. From Lope's words, we may conclude that the plot of *El Dómine Lucas* is based upon an actual occurrence, probably some student adventure in which the hero proved

[1] *Comedias* de Lope de Vega Carpio, ed. Hartzenbusch, Vol. I, Madrid, 1859, p. 43.

his valour in the bull-ring and his resourcefulness in love[1]. The story had doubtless lost nothing in the telling, for, as we see, Lope shrewdly refused to vouch for its truth. Lope himself, in adapting his material to meet the requirements of the stage, probably still further embellished and complicated the argument, until that which perhaps was originally a very slender plot developed into the involved intrigue of *El Dómine Lucas.*

It is not strange that in later years Lope should have cherished a peculiar affection for this early work. The play evoked in his memory youthful love and youthful friendships, happy days spent with his young wife, Isabel de Urbina, in the Duke of Alba's seat of Alba de Tormes. This was a period of his early manhood to which Lope frequently referred as the happiest in his life. Only five leagues distant was the great university town of Salamanca whose students were frequent visitors in Alba de Tormes—rich students like Floriano to take part in *fiestas,* and poor *capigorrones* like Decio in threadbare cloaks begging an alms of the passer-by. Lope's own student days were only a few years behind him. Evidently he enjoyed to the full the life of Salamanca and Alba de Tormes. *El Dómine Lucas* reflects this enjoyment. It is one of the freshest and most spontaneous of Lope's early plays.

But Lope had more substantial reasons for showing in his old age an especial fondness for this play. *El Dómine Lucas* was one of his first conspicuous successes. It is true that he had already been writing for the stage for several years; it is true that he had already won the position of foremost Spanish dramatist. But it was only about this time that he began to acquire that sureness of touch found in his later work. Very few of Lope's plays written prior to *El Dómine Lucas* have come down to us. The plays which he afterwards deemed worthy of publication began to be written about this time.

Lope himself, in the preface from which I have already quoted,

[1] The Conde de las Navas, in his work on bull-fighting entitled *El espectáculo más nacional,* Madrid, 1900, pp. 58 ff., gives much curious information on the subject of 'tauromachia' in Salamanca. There existed an unwritten law demanding that each candidate for the doctorate provide six 'toros de muerte' to be despatched by the student body. The university maintained a house on the Plaza Mayor from the windows of which the members of the different faculties looked down upon the sport. La Fuente, *Historia de las universidades,* Vol. III, Madrid, 1887, p. 104, fixes the number of bulls required at three. The requirement was apparently not made of poor students. We are told that the usage did not utterly cease until 1843. Gaspar Lucas Hidalgo, *Diálogos de apacible entretenimiento,* Barcelona, 1605, fol. 15 verso, declares humorously that the doctors of theology provided cocks rather than bulls—'porque no aya cuernos que dizen muy mal con la borla blanca de honestidad.' Such exploits as that of Floriano were every day incidents in the life of the Salamanca student; indeed, similar feats of daring can still be witnessed in Spain at any village *capea.*

testifies to the success which this play had on the occasion of its first production, generously giving much credit to the actor Melchor de Villalba. The vogue initiated by Villalba lasted many years. The piece was imitated and reworked like most successful plays. It was even burlesqued. This popularity is doubtless attributable to the freshness and novelty of the plot rather than to the excellence of Villalba's acting. Lope had at last 'found himself.' In this play and in *El Maestro de Danzar*, published about the same time, Lope gives the Spanish stage a new type—that of the resourceful lover who assumes a disguise, or acts a part, in the furtherance of his love intrigue. Henceforth the boards will be crowded with the master masquerading as man, the pretended pedagogue, the feigned astrologer, the dancing-master who does not know a step, the gardener with uncalloused hands, the *médecin malgré lui*, the lawyer innocent of the pandects, but who, like Portia, contrives to deliver Solomonic decisions. All these and many more are Dómine Lucas's own flesh and blood. I do not, of course, mean to imply that all or many of these types are immediate copies of Dómine Lucas. Some, it is true, are his descendants; others bear a more distant kinship. Disregarding the plays which show a remote resemblance, in the present article I propose to consider only a few, closely connected with the one we are studying.

II.

The first play to consider is another of Lope's, *El Caballero de Olmedo*[1]. What is the connection between the merry comedy of *Dómine Lucas* and the tragic story of Olmedo's knight? At first blush it seems strange that plays so diverse should have much in common. Yet in the popular ballads, from one of which Lope is supposed to have derived the main idea for this play, the knight's treacherous murder follows a love intrigue and an adventure in the bull-ring[2]. The similarity between this part of the plot and that of *El Dómine Lucas* is obvious. There is also to be noted another fact, which, while it may be nothing more than a coincidence, may possibly help to explain why Lope in the later play drew so largely from his earlier production. We have seen that the *Dómine Lucas* story was probably associated in the poet's mind with the Prince of Esquilache. Now, it is this same Prince of

[1] *Obras de Lope de Vega, publicadas por la Real Academia*, Vol. x, Madrid, 1899.

[2] Menéndez y Pelayo, *ibid.*, p. lxxviii, says that the only ballad on this subject that has come to his notice is that by the Prince of Esquilache. But cf. the *romance* preserved in the third act of the old version of *El Caballero de Olmedo*, of uncertain authorship: *Ocho comedias desconocidas*, ed. Schaeffer, Leipzig, 1887, Vol. i, p. 335.

Esquilache who has given to the *Caballero de Olmedo* legend its most poetic form[1]. The Prince of Esquilache's ballad can hardly be considered as Lope's source. He certainly does not follow it closely; and yet the love element and the bull-fight episode are therein alluded to. Menéndez y Pelayo thinks that the play and the ballad had some remote connection[2]. It is true that the Prince of Esquilache's shorter poems were not published until 1648, after Lope's death; but it was the custom of the time for men of letters to circulate their verse in manuscript[3]. Lope and the Prince were on terms of some intimacy. They exchanged verse[4]. Lope dedicated a play to Esquilache[5]. The two were united in their opposition to *culturanismo*. Both were intimate with the Duke of Alba. Lope may, then, have seen the Prince of Esquilache's ballad on the Knight of Olmedo, and associating him with this subject, just as he had previously connected him with the very similar *Dómine Lucas* story, it would have been natural for him to have worked the two plots into one. This he did in his version of *El Caballero de Olmedo*.

Menéndez y Pelayo finds in this play three elements[6]: one portion of the plot is derived from *El Dómine Lucas*, another from the *Celestina*, and the rest from the popular legend concerning *El Caballero de Olmedo*. I would call attention to the fact that the germ of the *Celestina* element may be found in *El Dómine Lucas*. The ruse by which Floriano conveys to Lucrecia a love-letter, while pretending to give her a charm against the toothache, causes the latter to exclaim:

> Quizá el dómine tocó
> Un paso de Celestina,
> En que da esta medicina
> Á otra Lucrecia cual yo[7].

But with this slight incident, the connection between the *Celestina* and *El Dómine Lucas* stops. In *El Caballero de Olmedo*, on the other hand,

[1] *Obras*, Lope de Vega, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxviii—lxxx.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. lxviii.

[3] In fact, one of the sonnets in Esquilache's collected works was inspired by Lope's death. To the modern reader it is conspicuous for its bad taste. Addressing the nymphs of the Tagus, he urges them as follows:

> No remitáis el llanto á Mançanares;
> Porque el comun dolor tendrá burlado,
> De poco rio, sentimiento poco.

Príncipe de Esquilache, *Obras*, Amberes, 1673, p. 67.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 392.

[5] Lope de Vega, *Comedias*, ed. Hartzenbusch, Vol. IV, Madrid, 1869, pp. 139 f.

[6] Menéndez y Pelayo merely mentions the fact that *El Dómine Lucas*, *El Caballero de Olmedo*, and *Marta la piadosa* are related, but does not study in detail the interrelation of these three plays (*op. cit.*, p. xcv). Nor, strangely enough, is it mentioned by Schack, Klein, nor Schaeffer.

[7] Lope de Vega, *Comedias*, ed. Hartzenbusch, Vol. I, Madrid, 1859, p. 48.

the *Celestina* element is very prominent. We have in Fabia a character who is almost a replica of Celestina, or of Lope's own Gerarda in the *Dorotea*. The stratagem by which Fabia conveys to Inés the news of Alonso's love is very similar to Floriano's ruse. But all other incidents having any connection with the *Celestina* appear to have been taken directly out of Rojas's work.

Two other important motives common to *El Caballero de Olmedo* and *El Dómine Lucas* are the bull-fight incident and the episode of the feigned teacher. We must, however, note these differences. In the earlier play, much less is made of the bull-fight. It merely provides an opportunity for the hero to display his prowess and win the favour of the heroine. In the latter play, on the other hand, the skill which the hero displays in the ring, and the favour there shown him by his lady, arouse his rival's envy. The latter then and there plans the murder which he afterwards executes. The bull-fight contributes directly to the tragic *dénouement*. As for the device of introducing into the lady's house a pretended teacher, in *El Dómine Lucas*, it is the lover himself who enacts the *rôle*; in *El Caballero de Olmedo*, it is the servant. In the former play, we have a writing lesson scene; in the latter, there is a Latin lesson.

III.

Leaving aside for the moment the consideration of *El Caballero de Olmedo*, let us next turn to another play inspired in part by *El Dómine Lucas*, Tirso de Molina's *Marta la piadosa*. That *El Dómine Lucas* is one of the sources of the last named play cannot be doubted. Tirso himself all but admits the fact. Instead of Dómine Lucas, we have in this play an equally entertaining Dómine Berrío, who, as we shall see, plays much the same *rôle*. In another of Tirso's best known plays, *Desde Toledo á Madrid*, there is a curious reference. The hero, Don Baltasar, in order to be near his lady, assumes the disguise of a muleteer. When asked his name he replies:

> Lucas
> Berrío soy en mi casa,
> Gracias á taita y al cura, etc.[1]

Is it too bold an assumption to say that '*taita*,' *i.e.*, 'father,' 'papa,' refers to Lope de Vega, and that the '*cura*,' 'priest,' is no other than Fray Gabriel Téllez himself? Does not the author clearly mean to imply that this strange compound name came from two sources, part

[1] Tirso de Molina, *Comedias*, ed. Hartzenbusch, Madrid, 1903, p. 489.

from Lope, part from Tirso? Tirso was fond of inserting in his plays more or less veiled allusions to himself and his friends[1]. Several lines following those I have quoted appear to contain personal allusions. However this may be, the uniting of the names Lucas and Berrío shows two very interesting things. First of all, it is tantamount to a confession on Tirso's part that Dómine Lucas is the original of his Dómine Berrío. Furthermore, *Desde Toledo á Madrid* was written in 1625[2], eleven years after *Marta la piadosa*[3], and approximately thirty years after the first production of *El Dómine Lucas*[4]. Tirso's evident expectation that his audience would understand the double allusion contained in the name so long after the first production of these plays speaks volumes for their popularity and continued success. Dómine Lucas and Dómine Berrío had doubtless become household words.

Let us now see what elements in *Marta la piadosa* were unmistakably derived from *El Dómine Lucas*. First, we have two sisters, Marta who is quick of wit (*discreta*), and Lucía who is dull (*boba*). They correspond exactly to Lucrecia and Leonarda of *El Dómine Lucas*, and like the latter, both love the same man. Lucía, like Leonarda, easily allows herself to be outwitted. The ruse by which she is induced publicly to proclaim her love for a man she does not love, and even to marry him, is nearly identical in both plays. Lucía, like Leonarda, at one time penetrates the pretended teacher's disguise, and is filled with envy on seeing the two lovers embrace, but like Leonarda allows herself to be deceived. These incidents Tirso certainly took from *El Dómine Lucas*. They are not to be found in *El Caballero de Olmedo*, which I shall now attempt to prove was another source of *Marta la piadosa*.

IV.

The most important character in *Marta la piadosa*, the character who gives the play its name, has no counterpart in *El Dómine Lucas*, but is to be found in *El Caballero de Olmedo*. It is the character of the female hypocrite who affects devotion in order to avoid a distasteful marriage. This ruse, resorted to by Marta in Tirso's play and by Inés in *El Caballero de Olmedo*, is not attempted by Lucrecia in *El Dómine Lucas*. The latter, although a hypocrite, does not express a desire to

[1] Cf. Cotarelo y Mori, *Tirso de Molina*, Madrid, 1893, pp. 129 ff., where similar personal allusions may be noted.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 161.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

[4] *El Dómine Lucas* must have been written between 1590 and 1595. Cf. Rennert, *Life of Lope de Vega*, Glasgow, 1904, pp. 98 ff.

take the veil. We have seen that the instruction received by the last-named heroine is in the art of writing. The other two plays agree in having each a Latin lesson scene. The heroines' desire to learn Latin is, of course, in keeping with their professed eagerness to become nuns. Other minor resemblances might be noted. It is obvious after the most casual perusal that *El Caballero de Olmedo* and *Marta la piadosa* have a close and intimate connection independent of *El Dómine Lucas.*

The real problem to be solved is this: did Lope borrow from Tirso or Tirso from Lope? Is Tirso's fascinating Marta (who, according to Martinenche, may have suggested to Molière certain ideas embodied in his *Tartuffe*) an original creation, or can the character be traced still farther back[1]?

The question of dates is first to be considered. The date of *Marta la piadosa* is firmly fixed. Cotarelo y Mori by internal evidence has shown it to have been written in 1614[2]. Unfortunately there is more uncertainty respecting the date of *El Caballero de Olmedo.* Menéndez y Pelayo has been unable definitely to determine it, but thinks the play must have been written *subsequently* to 1614, as it is not mentioned in the list of comedies in the preface to Lope's *Peregrino en su patria*[3]. The date 1614 given by Señor Menéndez must be a mistake. The first edition of the *Peregrino* was printed in 1604, while the second, containing the revised list of *comedias,* appeared in 1618. In neither is *El Caballero de Olmedo* mentioned. Señor Menéndez also thinks that the play is written in the style of Lope's maturer years. But all this is very slender evidence. We are not bound to believe that the *Peregrino* list was absolutely complete and that it is impossible for a play not included in the list to have been written previous to 1618. We have Lope's own assurance that the list is incomplete[4]. In a matter so delicate as the judging of Lope's style, a foreigner hesitates to set up a judgment contrary to that of Lope's learned editor. But *El Caballero de Olmedo* was not published till 1641. Is it not possible that Lope in his later years revised this play for the press just as he did others,

[1] Cf. Martinenche, *Molière et le théâtre espagnol*, Paris, 1906, p. 167.

[2] Cotarelo y Mori, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

[3] Cf. Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.* If the supposition of Mesonero Romanos, who thinks Monteser's burlesque is based upon Lope's *Caballero de Olmedo*, be correct, we should have no occasion to discuss this point; but Restori, *Zeit. f. roman. Phil.*, XXIX, p. 359, denies that the burlesque was based on the version of the play we are discussing and also shows that Monteser's play was probably written in 1651, instead of 1621 as supposed.

[4] For a discussion of this matter, cf. Rennert, *op. cit.*, p. 477.

including *El Dómine Lucas*? In the absence of a manuscript fixing the date, it seems to me that the question of priority can only be determined by a comparative study of the two plays in question.

It is stating the veriest commonplace to remark that, of the two, Lope is much the more original in invention. Where we find Lope and Tirso utilizing the same material, it is the natural presumption that Tirso plagiarized from Lope, not Lope from Tirso. Although Lope took many ideas from other authors, he seldom plundered the works of his contemporary rival dramatists. His latest biographer goes so far as to say that he never did[1]. It is not necessary to multiply examples of Tirso's plagiarisms from Lope. They are too well-known. But I should like to point out that in *Marta la piadosa* Tirso apparently utilizes still another of Lope's plays, *La discreta enamorada*. The Captain Urbina and his nephew the *alférez* of Tirso's play appear to be copies of the Captain Bernardo and his son the *alférez* Lucindo of *La discreta enamorada*. In both plays, the elderly soldier cherishes a passion for a young woman who avoids an unwelcome marriage by a stratagem. There is this difference, that Captain Urbina Bernardo is the rival of his own son, while Captain Urbina is not the rival of the *alférez* but of another young gallant. Fenisa, the heroine of *La discreta enamorada*, is a worthy sister of Inés and Marta. She is equally rich in expedients. She, too, is hypocritical, but she does not affect a longing for the cloister. I am well aware that the priority of *La discreta enamorada* to *Marta la piadosa* should be proved, not assumed, but it is impossible to determine its exact date. We have no means of dating *La discreta enamorada* beyond the fact that it appeared in the *Peregrino* list of 1618. But even so, the laws of probability would favour its having been published before rather than after 1614, the date of the writing of *Marta la piadosa*. At all events, it has been shown that *Marta la piadosa* bears a close resemblance to at least three of Lope's plays, one of which beyond dispute was written approximately twenty years earlier. The dates of the other two plays are admittedly uncertain. The natural presumption is that the man who certainly plagiarized in the case of the one play (*El Dómine Lucas*) probably did so from the other two.

But there are better reasons for supposing *El Caballero de Olmedo* to have been written before *Marta la piadosa*. Apart from these two plays, the female hypocrite is a very common character in the Spanish drama and novel. Where did she originate? Martinenche considers Celestina to be the arch-hypocrite, the progenitress of the whole race

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 395 note.

of hypocrites in Spanish literature[1]. Celestina's hypocrisy is well drawn by Rojas. Parmeno in describing her character says: 'Nunca passaua sin missa ni bisperas ni dexaua monesterios de frailes ni de monjas; esto porque alli fazia ella sus alleluyas é conciertos[2].' And Celestina herself says: 'Yo te prometo, señora, en yendo de aquí, me vaya por estos monesterios, donde tengo frayles deuotos míos, y les dé el mismo cargo que tú me das. Y demás desto, ante que me desayune, dé quatro bueltas á mis cuentas[3].' Clearly no better model of hypocrisy could be desired. We have observed a trace of the *Celestina* influence in *El Dómine Lucas* and a great deal of it in *El Caballero de Olmedo*. Aside from the character of Marta, I see little trace of the *Celestina* influence in *Marta la piadosa*, and nothing of the kind that could not have been derived indirectly through the medium of the other two plays. On the other hand, *El Caballero de Olmedo* shows direct imitation. The character Fabia is a slavish imitation of the hag Celestina. The idea of the nocturnal expedition to the foot of a gallows to extract a tooth from the mouth of a swinging criminal can be traced back to the *Celestina*[4]. Now, I ask, is not the character of the hypocrite more likely to have originated in *El Caballero de Olmedo*, a work strongly and directly influenced by the *Celestina*, than in *Marta la piadosa*, where that influence was slight? The two authors did not develop the character of the female hypocrite from the *Celestina* independently. The similarity of the Latin lesson scene shows one play to have been derived from the other.

But it may be objected that Celestina is a real hypocrite, and that Inés and Marta are hypocrites for the occasion only. True, but the one kind of hypocrite could easily have suggested the other. In *El Caballero de Olmedo* we have both kinds. The temporary hypocrisy of Inés is an invention of the real hypocrite, Fabia. Fabia is the prompter of Inés throughout, and the latter's professed desire to become a nun is only

[1] Martinenche, *op. cit.*, p. 160. Lope himself refers to Celestina as the ancestress of other hypocrites. In the scene referred to in the text, where Floriano gives Lucrecia a love-letter, while pretending to pass her a charm against the toothache, the latter exclaims:

¡Qué santidad que fingía
Hasta ponerla en mi mano!
Basta; que de aqueste oficio
Dejó Celestina nietos,
Y no con menos efetos
Para engañar el juicio.

Obras de Lope de Vega, ed. Hartzenbusch, Vol. I, p. 49.

[2] *Comedia de Calisto é Melibea*, ed. Foulché-Delbosc, Barcelona-Madrid, 1900, p. 23.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 91. 'Siete dientes quitó á vn ahorcado con vnas tenazicas de pelar cejas, mientra yo le descalcé los çapatos.'

part of a very complicated intrigue of Fabia's devising. Tirso's Marta, on the other hand, needs no prompter. Always sufficient unto herself, her nimble wit never plays her false. The colourless *dueña* who helps along her stratagem takes, but does not give, counsel. There is no real hypocrite in the play who could have suggested the fictitious one.

But the hypocritical lover seems to have still another *raison d'être* in *El Caballero de Olmedo* which she lacks in *Marta la piadosa*. We have seen that another source utilized by Lope was the popular romantic legend which had sprung up concerning the Knight of Olmedo. The popular ballads, without much doubt, make Don Alonso's sweetheart enter a nunnery after the murder of her lover. The earlier play on this same subject, published in 1606, and based on a *romance*, has this *dénouement*[1]. Now, what more natural than that Lope, working toward this ending, should make the woman whose final destiny was to be the cloister profess in the days of her happiness an insincere desire to become a nun? What an opportunity for dramatic irony! In the whole Spanish drama, there is nothing more tragic than Inés's sudden change from feigned to real piety after hearing the news of her lover's death. The jest had become grim earnest. What a wealth of emotion is condensed in her simple utterance:

¡ Lo que de burlas te dije,
Señor, de veras te ruego!

To a bigoted seventeenth century audience, there may have been something of sacrilege in Inés's trifling with piety. Her lover's death may have seemed a well-deserved visitation of divine wrath. Whether or not this was present in Lope's mind, he has here achieved one of his strongest tragic effects. The comedy of the first two acts makes the tragedy of the last stand forth in startling relief. To cause the hypocritically pious lover to embrace in sad earnest a religious life was a master-stroke of genius.

In *Marta la piadosa* I can find nothing which would account for the invention of the character. The intrigue is less important than Marta herself. The play is almost Molièresque in its subordination of plot to the portrayal of a type; and it must be admitted that Tirso's portrayal of the hypocritical lover is the more successful of the two. His Latin lesson scene is much more spirited and entertaining than Lope's. One is reminded of Dame Quickly's Latin lesson in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Marta is infinitely more interesting than Inés. Not but that

[1] Schaeffer, *Ocho comedias desconocidas*, Vol. I, Leipzig, 1887.

Lope could have drawn the hypocritical lover fully as well had he cared to do so, but his interest was centred in Fabia rather than in Inés. If Tirso borrowed from Lope, he improved upon his model. If Lope plagiarized Tirso, he cannot be excused on the ground that he surpassed his model in those few things that he could have taken.

But all this leads me to think that Tirso was the borrower this time as in most other cases; that *El Dómine Lucas* and *El Caballero de Olmedo*, and probably *La discreta enamorada* as well, are sources of *Marta la piadosa*; that, therefore, Menéndez y Pelayo has fixed the date of *El Caballero de Olmedo* too late. I should date the play previous to the year 1614, the date of *Marta la piadosa*.

Some may object that, if Lope admittedly rewrote *El Dómine Lucas*, Tirso may have utilized an earlier version of the play than that known to us, and the earlier version may have contained the female hypocrite and the Latin lesson episode, lacking in the play as we now have it. This is of course a possibility, but scarcely a probability. Lope tells us that he corrected the play, but nothing he says would indicate that the changes made were far-reaching. Chorley considers that the play has no *figura de donaire*. Decio is far from being the conventional *gracioso*. Now, had Lope late in life radically altered the plot, he could hardly have failed to supply the comic part which his audiences had come to expect. Lope's humorous allusions to the condition of the play as he found it in his old age seem to refer merely to the sins of copyists.

V.

The seventeenth century saw at least two other plays named *Dómine Lucas*. The first of these was *El Dómine Lucas y la fiesta en el aire*, described as a 'comedia jocosa en castellano y latín macarrónico.' It was written by Padre Pedro de Salas and was dated at Valladolid, the fourth of January, 1618[1]. The manuscript of this play is probably no longer in existence; but it appears from the title that Dómine Lucas had become accepted as a type of pedant who mingled Latin with the vernacular. Lope had made little use of this idea. Decio and Floriano introduce a few scraps of Latin into their conversation, but that is all. Tirso, too, had the good taste not to introduce an undue amount of Latin into the dialogue, although an occasional bilingual pun is not wanting.

[1] Barrera, *Catálogo*, Madrid, 1860, p. 352.

Another burlesque *Dómine Lucas* was written by Francisco Manuel de Melo[1]. Barrera states vaguely that it still existed in manuscript in the year 1747.

The *Dómine Lucas* of Jose Cañizares, produced with a most elaborate ballet in the presence of the royal family in the Buen Retiro gardens on the occasion of the marriage of the Infanta María Luisa to the Archduke Leopold in 1765, has no connection, other than that of name, with Lope's comedy. This fact was long ago pointed out by Don Vicente García de la Huerta, and later by Ticknor and Schaeffer[2]. Durán and Paz y Melia are wrong in considering Cañizares's play a reworking of Lope's[3]. It appears to be a composite of several others. The influence of Lope's *Dama boba* is plain. Calderón's *La desdicha de la vez* furnished another motive. The *montañés* was such a stock character in the *comedia* that perhaps the resemblance which Cañizares's play bears to Calderón's *Guardarse del agua mansa* is only accidental. However, there can be little doubt that Cañizares borrowed from a play variously styled *La boba y el Vizcaino* and *Encontrarse dos arroyuelos.* This play was published in the *Comedias nuevas escritas por los mejores ingenios de España* (Madrid, 1665). It is attributed in the index to Don Juan Velaz de Guevara, but a manuscript version of the same play, preserved in the Biblioteca Nacional, names Maestro Antonio Fajardo Azeredo as the author. In either case, it was written before the *Dómine Lucas* of Cañizares. In both plays, the two stock characters of *boba* and *montañés* are introduced. Other characters are incidental. Cañizares's *Dómine Lucas* is almost certainly a reworking of this play. Cañizares doubtless chose the name Dómine Lucas because that character had become identified in the popular mind with burlesque and musical ballets. He had degenerated into a hero of *opéra comique. El Caballero de Olmedo* met with a similar fate. First burlesqued, this hero of tragedy ended by giving his name to a popular dance[4].

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP.

PRINCETON, N.J., U.S.A.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 237.

[2] García de la Huerta is quoted to that effect by the anonymous author of the preface to Lope's *Dómine Lucas*, published by Sancha, Madrid, 1841. Cf. Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, Vol. II, New York, 1854, p. 428, note; and Schaeffer, *Geschichte des spanischen Nationaldramas*, Vol. II, Leipzig, 1890, p. 299.

[3] Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, Madrid, 1899, p. 150.

[4] Monreal, *Cuadros viejos*, Madrid, 1878, p. 86, note.

NOTES ON THE SUPPOSED DRAMATIC CHARACTER OF THE 'LUDI' IN THE GREAT WARDROBE ACCOUNTS OF EDWARD III.

The first literary historian to draw attention to the Great Wardrobe Accounts of Edward III was Warton[1]. He interpreted *ludos domini Regis ad festum natalis domini celebratum*[2] *apud Guldefordum*[3] as '*plays* or *sports* of the King, held in the castle of Guildford at the feast of Christmas.' There seems to be no doubt that he regarded the *ludi* as dramatic to a certain extent at least, and places them *in* the castle, though *apud* does not necessarily imply this. A part of the entry, *xiiij crestes cum tibiis reversatis et calciatis, xiiij crestes cum montibus et cuniculis*, he confesses that he does not perfectly understand[4]. This point we shall take up later.

Collier is much more positive: 'In 1348 Edward III kept his Christmas in the castle of Guildford, and there these *ludi* were exhibited: from the nature of the materials and properties furnished it is sufficiently evident that they were of a dramatic character[5].' Brotanek[6], the latest historian of the Masque, also classifies these *ludi* as dramatic, speaking of them as 'Maskeraden' and 'Aufführungen.'

In thus accepting the *ludi* as dramatic, Brotanek has remained in the common tradition, which has continued unbroken from the time of Warton. The first to question the dramatic nature of these was E. K. Chambers, whose *Mediæval Stage* appeared a year after Brotanek's work (1903). Chambers issues the warning that the term *ludi* must

[1] *History of English Poetry*, Vol. II, pp. 219—220 (Hazlitt's Edition, 1871). The Accounts are printed in full by Sir N. H. Nicolas in *Archæologia*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 1—163.

[2] The original is full of abbreviations. Warton writes *celebratos*, but the connection seems to be with *festum* rather than with *ludos*.

[3] Text in *Archæologia*, Vol. XXXI, p. 37. Printed also in R. Brotanek, *Die englischen Maskenspiele* (1907), p. 2, and in E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, Vol. I, p. 392.

[4] *History of English Poetry*, II, p. 220, Note 2.

[5] J. P. Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, Vol. I, pp. 22—23.

[6] R. Brotanek, *Die englischen Maskenspiele*, 1902.

not be pressed, that it does not necessarily imply anything dramatic, and that the analogies suggest that it is a wide generic term roughly equivalent to 'disport,' or the 'revels' of the Tudor vocabulary[1].

I wish to present some evidence which will tend to establish Chambers' contention that the *ludi* are not dramatic of necessity; and, further, to show that they are more probably tournaments than 'disports,' or 'revels.'

1. Edward III was deeply interested in knighthood and chivalry. His deepest passion seems to have been the tournament. In the year 1348 the greatest of all English orders of knighthood, the Order of the Garter, was founded; and on important feasts like Christmas mere dramatic performances would scarcely displace the nobler actions of the knightly representatives of King Arthur and his Table Round[2]. A further direct reason for believing that tournaments would naturally grace such important feasts is that they were a royal prerogative[3]. They were, in a very real sense, *ludi domini Regis.*

2. Moreover, the word *ludus* does not necessarily indicate anything dramatic. The meanings given in Du Cange under the word *ludus* show this very clearly. For instance under *ludus natalis* we find a citation of 1381 describing a sort of game at single-stick. Conversely, *hastiludium, burdice,* which is, of course, a tournament, is described as consisting of two sides in costumes very similar to those of the *ludi* in the Wardrobe Accounts[4]; and would seem to break down the distinction between the *ludus* and the *hastiludium* maintained by Chambers[5].

3. Let us consider the articles mentioned in the Accounts in some detail. For the Christmas of 1347–1348 the entry is as follows:

> Et ad faciendum ludos domini Regis ad festum Natalis domini celebratum apud Guldefordum anno Regis xxi in quo expendebantur 84 tunicae de bokeram diversorum colorum, 42 viseres diversorum similitudinum (14 similitudines facierum mulierum, 14 similitudines facierum hominum cum barbis, 14 similitudines capitum angelorum de argento), 28 crestes (14 crestes cum tibiis reversatis et calciatis, 14 crestes cum montibus et cuniculis[6]), 14 clocae depictae, 14 capita draconum, 14 tunicae albae, 14 capita pavonum cum alis, 14 tunicae depictae cum oculis pavonum, 14 capita cygnorum cum suis alis, 14 tunicae de tela linea depictae, 14 tunicae depictae cum stellis de auro et argento vapulatis[7].

[1] *The Mediæval Stage,* Vol. I, pp. 392—393.

[2] See Sir N. H. Nicolas, *Archæologia,* Vol. XXXII, and *History of the Orders of Chivalry,* 4 vols. (1842).

[3] See the numerous prohibitions of tournaments in Rymer, *Fœdera, passim.*

[4] Under *Burdice* in Du Cange: '...una pars in habitu monachali veniret, et altera pars in habitu canonicali'—*de Gestis Edwardi I.*

[5] *The Mediæval Stage,* I, 392.

[6] This item, which puzzled Warton (*op. cit.,* II, 220), refers to coats of arms which contain the not unfamiliar devices of legs reversed and shod, and mountains and conies.

[7] *Archæologia,* XXXI, p. 37.

For the Christmas of 1348–1349 the following articles are provided:

Et ad faciendum ludos Regis ad festum Natalis domini anno Regis xxii celebratum apud Ottefordum, ubi expendebantur viseres, videlicet, 12 capita hominum et desuper tot capita leonum, 12 capita hominum et tot capita elephantum, 12 capita hominum cum alis vespertilionum, 12 capita de wodewose, 17 capita virginum, 14 supertunicae de worsted rubro...et totidem tunicae de worsted viridi[1].

For Epiphany, 1349, we have the following entry:

Et ad faciendum ludos Regis in festo Epiphaniae domini celebrato apud Mertonum ubi expendebantur 13 visers cum capitibus draconum et 13 visers cum capitibus hominum habentibus dyademata[2].

This concludes the entries referring to *ludi*. Those referring to *hastiludia* are more numerous—there are some twelve in all—but they are much more summary. However, in these entries are mentioned visors[3], tunics[4], and hoods[5]. These, especially the visors, play an important part in the *ludi*, and have been made much of by those who have contended for the dramatic character of these festivities. From the entries in the Wardrobe Accounts, they seem to be an important part of the equipment of the *hastiludia* as well.

In some of the entries concerning the *hastiludia*, some of the equipment is referred to in general terms as 'necessaries,' or 'divers articles[6].' What these were we can see from another source[7]. The equipment of a knight consisted of (1) a tunic; (2) a sur-coat, or over-tunic; (3) a pair of ailettes, *i.e.* little wings at the shoulders; (4) a crest; (5) a shield; (6) a helmet of leather; (7) a sword of balon. In this list we have all the articles mentioned in the entries concerning the *ludi* at Guildford, Otford, and Merton.

4. Moreover, the groupings of the articles in the entries point to a tournament rather than to a dramatic spectacle. 'It is material to remember that the encounters at Tournaments and Jousts consisted of two parties, the challengers and the challenged,...each party being led by its own chief, and all wearing precisely the same dress and ornaments. Some peculiar object was selected as the predominant Symbol or Badge for each Joust, which was worn by all who tilted; and the members of each party were considered to belong to, and to form the Companions of, its leader[8].'

The number in a party varied from about five to forty, twelve to twenty being the more usual number. The *ludus* at Guildford would

[1] *Archæologia*, xxxi, 43.
[2] *Archæologia*, xxxi, 43.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 29, 30, 39.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 26—29.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 26—29.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 40, 41.
[7] *Ibid.*, xvii, pp. 299—304.
[8] *Ibid.*, xxxi, p. 113.

thus provide for eight parties of fourteen each; that at Otford for eight parties of twelve each (with the exception of the seventeen 'virgins' heads'); and that at Merton for two parties of thirteen each.

This interpretation of the *ludus* as a tournament gives a satisfactory explanation of the entry concerning the twenty-eight crests, in the Guildford *ludus*, which puzzled Warton and which has been passed over in silence by all his successors. They are simply insignia of two parties, just as the various visors (faces of women, faces of men, heads of angels) and heads (of dragons, of peacocks, of swans) are the insignia of six other parties. To the rather obvious objection that the costumes required by this interpretation of the entry are absurd, it is necessary only to refer to what the tournament had become by Sidney's day, when he fought as one of the Four Foster-Children of Desire.

5. A later piece of evidence, dating from about 1450, shows that the tournament had a feature which has been supposed to be peculiar to the masque in its later developments; namely, the unmasking and the dancing between the jousters and the ladies. A manual of the tournament thus gives the order of procedure:

> And when the herawdes krye à lostell, à lostell [*i.e.*, to the lodging, or tiring-house] then shall all the six gentlemen within [*i.e.*, the six challengers, as contrasted with the six 'gentlemen without' who accept the challenge] unhelme them before the seide ladyes [*i.e.*, the 'ladies within,' the ladies of the 'gentlemen within'] and make their obeisance, and go home unto their logging & chaunge the... [Unfinished in MS.]
>
> Then shall come the women without to the ladies within, and one shall present the prizes to the three gentlemen without who have jousted best...
>
> Then shall he that the diamaunt is geve unto [*i.e.*, the first prize] take a lady by the hande and begynne the daunce. And whan thee ladyes have dauncid as long as them likith, than spyce wyne and drynk and than avoyde[1].

It seems not improbable that in the festivities of Edward III the ladies may have taken a part; as we see, for instance, that, at the *hastiludium* at Lichfield[2], two hundred and eighty-eight visors were provided for the women. The *ludi* were no doubt glorious spectacles, when judged by the taste of the time; but there seems to be no good reason for supposing that they were in any proper sense dramatic.

ARTHUR BEATTY.

MADISON, WISCONSIN, U.S.A.

[1] *Archæologia*, Vol. XVII, p. 294.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXI, p. 29.

THE ALLITERATION OF 'PIERS PLOWMAN.'

An Examination and Comparison of the Three Texts.

The following examination has been conducted partly on the lines of Rosenthal's examination which appeared in *Anglia* I. It was impossible, however, to work from his tables, even so far as they went, because of his peculiar system of stress allotment and his refusal to recognise that the alliteration often falls on wholly unaccented syllables. The whole ground has therefore been examined afresh.

It is difficult to lay down fixed rules for such work; e.g., it would probably be doing injustice to the poet's intention if we considered that he had increased the normal number of rhyme letters every time an insignificant word happened to begin with the rhyme-letter in addition to the three regular stressed alliterating syllables. I have tried to be consistent in reckoning an extra rhyme-letter only when the word was one of some importance—noun, verb, etc.—or when it bore some amount of verse or sentence stress.

As regards the text, Skeat's two volume edition of 1886 has been used, but it seemed best to adhere as closely as possible to one MS. for each version. For A I have kept to the Vernon MS. as far as it goes, then the Trinity, and for Passus XII the Rawlinson. For B the Laud MS. has been used, and for C the Phillipps. These have never been departed from for the sake of improving the metre, but only when there was an evident scribal error and the sense demanded some other reading. This has necessitated the frequent restoration of readings given in Dr Skeat's footnotes, such restoration being far more frequent in A than in B or C.

Professor Manly has said that an examination of the alliteration would help to prove his theory of fivefold authorship, but the result of this investigation tends rather in the opposite direction. On the

whole, a steady development along various lines is evident and to make this clear the additional matter occurring in the C text, amounting to about 1340 lines, has been considered separately. The two parts of A (divided at the points where Professor Manly thinks he sees a change) viz., A. Prol. I—A. VIII. 134, and A. VIII. 135—A. XII. 56 are referred to as A_1 and A_2: C, omitting long new passages, as C_1 and the collected additional lines as C_2.

The scheme of alliteration is the usual one of *aa.ax*, but in all three versions the poet has varied this rather freely, sometimes adding an extra rhyme-letter, sometimes omitting one, occasionally writing a line without any alliteration at all, and also indulging in lines which have two rhyme-letters: *aa.bb*; *ab.ab*; or *ab.ba*.

1. *Increase of number of rhyme-letters.*

(*a*) More than two rhyme-letters in the first half verse. This is the most frequent variation from the norm, and occurs in very even proportion in the two parts of A, in B and in C_1 and C_2, since in all five it never falls below 8 °/₀ of the lines and never reaches 9 °/₀. There is a gradual though slight increase, as will be seen by the following: A_1 8·04: A_2 8·58: B 8·73: C_1 8·63: C_2 8·92.

(*b*) More than one rhyme-letter in the second half verse. Here there is less agreement, the percentage varying from 6·58 to 5·28. It is to be noted, however, that the difference between A_1 and A_2, 5·74 °/₀ and 6·58 °/₀ respectively, is less than the difference between C_1 and C_2, the proportion in the latter case being 6·49 to 5·28.

2. *Decrease of number of rhyme-letters.*

(*a*) The first rhyme-letter missing (*xa.ax*). The proportion decreases regularly from 2·7 °/₀ in A_1 to 1·86 in C_2, except that A_2 gives the astonishing result of 5·44. One has to remember, however, that in A_2 we have to draw conclusions from a very small number of lines —735—the other sections being much larger. Differences almost as great appear between the first two Visions of A and between two sections of B: e.g. the part of B which corresponds with A has the rhyme of *h* and vowel in 2·88 °/₀ of its lines, while the passage B. XIX and XX has 5·22 °/₀.

(*b*) The second rhyme-letter missing (*ax.ax*). Here we have a very regular decrease from 2·43 °/₀ in A_1 to 1·35 °/₀ in C_1. C_2 has a slight rise to 1·56 °/₀.

(*c*) The third rhyme-letter missing (*aa . xx*). A more frequent variation, ranging from 4·52 to 2·48 °/₀. Like 2 (*b*) it gradually decreases, but rises somewhat in C_2.

3. *Lines containing two rhyme-letters.*

aa . bb. For such an unusual construction this variation is rather frequent. Beginning in A_1 at 2·09 °/₀ it decreases with perfect regularity throughout the second part of A and the B and C texts, descending in C_2 to 1·11 °/₀. Little importance can be attached to the variations *ab . ab* and *ab . ba*, as though they both occur in all three texts and in both parts of A, the number of cases in each is very small. Yet the latter order is, on the whole, very evenly distributed[1].

4. *h rhyming with a vowel.*

This increases steadily from 2·74 °/₀ in A_1 to 4·31 in C_2 except that there is a slight decrease in A_2.

5. *s rhyming with sh or sch.*

Here we have a perfectly regular decrease from 1·53 °/₀ to ·14.

6. *The rhyming together of f and v.*

This is found throughout, increasing in the later texts, though never very frequent. Professor Skeat in his edition of text C (E. E. T. S., 1873) attached great importance to this peculiarity because of its extreme rarity in other alliterative poems, and regarded it as a connecting link between the three texts.

Rosenthal has also mentioned the rhyming of *w* with *v* in romance words. This is of so rare occurrence, there being only about eight cases in the whole of the three texts, that one can scarcely be quite certain that it is intentional. The rhyming of *f* with *w* is scarcely more frequent and it therefore offers no definite evidence.

7. *c* (*k*) *rhyming with ch.*

Whether any importance can be attached to this is doubtful. Of the eight or nine cases occurring in the first part of A, five are due to the spelling 'churche' which in B is usually represented by 'kirke.' In B words beginning with *k* are made to rhyme with 'churche' three times and with other words beginning with *ch* twice.

Out of twenty-five cases of this rhyme in C twenty-one depend

[1] There is some irregularity in the first of these and a little in the second, but less than that between the first two Visions of A and the two parts of B mentioned under 2 (*a*).

on the word 'churche,' which in nearly every case is found in many of the other MSS. as 'kirke.' The six cases in C_2 are all 'churche' cases[1].

As this is a matter which is likely to depend chiefly on the individual preference of the scribe, no inference can be drawn from the somewhat unequal distribution of this rhyme.

8. *The rhyming together of k (c) and g.*

This is found in all the five sections but is not frequent in any. It decreases somewhat irregularly.

9. *Lines without any rhyme-letter.*

This is a variation which increases steadily from ·35 °/₀ to ·89 °/₀ but it sinks a little in C_1. It is worth while noting a new passage in C_2, I. 95—124, in which no less than eight cases occur.

10. Another point which up till now has received little attention is that in all parts of the poem many lines occur which have the same rhyme-letters three times, but not in the order *aa.ax*. One of the most frequent of these is a line bearing three rhyme-letters in the first half verse and none in the second. It occurs fairly regularly throughout, never much above or below 1 °/₀. The forms *xa.aa* and *ax.aa* are less frequent but also occur throughout, the first increasing slightly and regularly except for A_2, and the second decreasing slightly and regularly. The form *aa.xa*, noticed by Schipper, is met with oftener than the others, increasing regularly and very slightly from 1·55 °/₀ in A_1 to 1·71 °/₀ in C_2, except that it sinks to 1·19 in B.

11. A liking for intricate alliteration displays itself in all three texts, especially in long lines bearing one or two secondary stresses. Forms like the following appear occasionally throughout, *aa.abb*, *aa.bab*, *aab.ab*, and *aab.abb*.

12. A more important consideration than any single one of the foregoing is the placing of the rhyme-letter on a syllable bearing weak or secondary stress[2]. This is found most frequently in the second half line. A very common case is the placing of the third rhyme-letter on a preposition in the anacrusis, as:

> And *w*ikkede *w*eyes · *w*ith here good amende,
> And *b*rygges to*b*roke · *b*y the heye weyes. C. x. 31, 32.

[1] B and C use both 'kirke' and 'churche,' B preferring the former; C, if we limit ourselves to the Phillipps MS., the latter. 'Kirke' does not, I believe, occur at all in A. B has 'kirke' or 'churche' as the alliteration needs *k* or *ch*: some of the C MSS. follow in this.

[2] That this occurs is acknowledged by Skeat and by Luick, though Rosenthal denies that alliteration can fall on weak stress syllables.

But the alliteration is sometimes made to fall on a conjunction or even a particle:

*Fo*lweden him *fa*ste · *for* thei hedden to done. A. iv. 85.
*Tr*euthe herde *te*lle her-of · and *to* Peres he sent. B. vii. 1.

At the beginning of the prologue in the A text this is by no means common, but it increases in frequency with remarkable steadiness throughout the whole of A, only pulling up a little now and then at the beginning of a Passus. The slackening of regard for the relation between alliteration and stress is continued in B in which also it increases, and so in C, until in the new parts of the latter this relation is sometimes quite obscured and one pauses to consider whether a line shall be held to be without alliteration, so inconspicuous are the rhyme-letters.

It will be seen from what has been said that there are no really striking differences in the alliteration of the various parts of the poem. Most variations from the norm are very evenly distributed or show a fairly regular increase or decrease in the successive versions, which would often be perfectly regular but for A_2. It has been shown that the differences between the two parts of A are no greater than may be found in other parts of the poem if we take passages equally short. It must also be remembered that not only does A consist of two separate works, the second written probably after an interval of a few years, but that the examination of this second work is founded on three different MSS.[1]

In almost every case of inequality between A_1 and A_2 or of interruption of an otherwise regular development it will be found that P. xi, part of which is from the Trinity MS. and P. xii from the Rawlinson, show an undue proportion of the variation in question.

On the whole, the alliteration of the new lines in C is slightly, very slightly, more correct than in the first part of A. A glance at Rosenthal's tables would lead one to imagine that the difference was great, but it is to be remembered that while the poet revised and amended former incorrect lines, he wrote many new lines containing the old errors.

One important point remains to be noticed. While the C text is slightly more correct in furnishing the exact number of rhyme-letters in the regular order, these are more often than in A, and rather more

[1] An examination founded on Skeat's text shows much less variation between the two parts.

often than in B, placed on syllables bearing secondary or weak stress. The *senkung* is very often enlarged, so that there are more words in the line, which, once we grant that the alliteration need not always coincide with the chief stress, makes the task of finding suitable words much easier. As a result, the effect of this later work is not so decidedly alliterative as that of the earlier; the alliteration has now become almost as much a matter for the eye as for the ear.

It seems to me that this is exactly what one would expect from a man writing over and over again, as he advanced in years, a poem of this type. Never primarily concerned with form, it was most natural that, as the years went by and he grew graver and still more concerned with moral ideas, he should care less and less about metrical effect, though long habit and the continual presence of the poem in his mind and before his eyes would prevent technical matters being neglected to any very serious extent.

This examination appears to prove that the alliteration gives no support to Professor Manly's theory. The differences between the texts are never very striking, even if they stood alone and entirely unexplained, while the similarities are many, the gradual increases and decreases being especially striking and suggestive of the gradual development of a single artist. At least, I think, it will be admitted that the alliteration gives no conclusive evidence one way or the other; but so far as it goes, it seems to me to tend distinctly in favour of the old 'one-man' theory.

MARY DEAKIN.

MANCHESTER.

ANTHONY MUNDAY, PAMPHLETEER AND PURSUIVANT.

I. The Second and Third Blast.

Munday's activity, like that of many men of similar calibre in modern Russia, seems to have been chiefly divided between journalism and espionage. In 1578 he visited Rome, ostensibly as a convert to Romanism, but really as a spy bent on penetrating the secrets of the English seminary where he was unsuspectingly received and kindly treated. Probably he was not yet in the service of Elizabeth's government, and Mr Seccombe suggests in the *Dictionary of National Biography* that the object of his visit to Rome was simply to get interesting 'copy' for his master John Allde, the stationer, to whom in October, 1576, he had been bound apprentice for eight years. Perhaps his experiences in Rome called the government's attention to his qualifications, for in 1582 he had become one of the regular agents for ferreting out popish plots and running priests to earth. Richard Topcliffe the head of this department described him to the queen's serjeant, John Puckering, as a man 'who wants no sort of wit'; but Munday's undoubted abilities were not counterbalanced by any weight of honesty, for we find him succumbing to the standing temptation of his profession—extortion by blackmail. This, however, did not impair his reputation with the authorities, for in 1584 he is spoken of as 'one of the messengers of her majestie's chamber,' and he seems from this time forward to have been regularly employed as a pursuivant, especially in all cases of recusancy and religious trouble.

Munday's pen was one of the busiest of the age, and his anti-papal work soon led to publication. The execution of Campion took place in December, 1581. On January 29, 1582, a tract appeared from Munday's hand entitled *A Discoverie of Edmund Campion...published by A. M. sometime the Popes Scholler, allowed in the seminarie at Roome amongst them.* Within a few weeks a reply appeared by one describing himself as 'a Catholike preist' under the title of *A true reporte of the death and martyrdome of M. Campion...* The interest of this tract is in the

aspersions it makes upon Munday's character. On sig. D 4^{v} appears 'A caueat to the reader touching A. M. his discouery,' a sentence of which runs as follows:—'Anthony Munday...who first was a stage player (no doubt a calling of some creditt) [marginal note 'Northbroukes booke against plaiers'] after an aprentise which tyme he wel feined with deceauing of his master then wandring towardes Italy, by his owne reporte became a coosener in his iourney. Comming to Rome, in his short abode there, was charitably relieued, but neuer admitted in the seminary as he pleseth to lye in the title of his booke, and being wery of well doing, returned home to his first vomite againe. I omite to declare howe this scholler new come out of Italy did play extempore, those gentlemen and others whiche were present, can best giue witnes of his dexterity, who being wery of his folly, hissed him from his stage. Then being thereby discouraged, he set forth a balet against playes, but yet (o constant youth) he now beginnes againe to ruffle upon the stage.' In a pamphlet, of which the address 'to the reader' is signed '22 March 1582,' Munday replied both to this defence of Campion and another which had appeared in French. On sig. D iij of his *Breefe Aunswer made unto two seditious Pamphlets* appears a section entitled 'An answere to his caueat concerning me and my Discouerie.' By way of rebutting the accusation quoted above, Munday prints an unsolicited testimonial to his behaviour from his late master John Allde and repeats his former statement that he had been received into the English seminary at Rome. But, and this is the striking point, he keeps a discreet silence concerning the extempore play, its unfortunate conclusion and the subsequent 'balet against plays.' We may therefore conclude that this part at least of 'a catholike preist's' indictment was substantially correct.

There are several points of interest in this indictment. First it may be noticed how ready the 'catholike' is to adopt the puritan's attitude towards the stage. He supports his sarcastic remark upon the dignity of the acting profession by a reference to Northbroke's *Treatise* against dicing, dancing, vain plays and interludes, and the reference shows how famous that book, published in 1577, had already become. Again, the phrase 'returned home to his first vomite againe' is curiously similar to a remark of Gosson's in his *Playes Confuted in Five Actions* (1582). After giving certain reasons which induced him to take up the pen for the second time against the stage Gosson says:—'Beside this, hauing once already writtẽ against playes, which no mã that euer wrote plaies, did, but one, who hath chãged his coppy, and

turned himself like ye dog to his vomite to plays again. And being falsly accused my self to do ye like, it is needfull for me to write againe[1].' The similarity of phrasing may be accidental, but I am convinced that Gosson and the 'catholike preist' are referring to the same man.

Gosson's first book against the stage, *The School of Abuse*, had been published in the autumn of 1579. Between this date and 1582, when *Playes Confuted* appeared, two attacks were made upon the stage, the first the famous *Second and third blast of retreat from plays and theatres* which was licensed on October 18, 1580, to Henry Denham, and the second,

> A Ringing Retraite courageouslie sounded
> Wherein Plaies and Players are fytlie confounded,

licensed to Edward White on November 10 of the same year. The latter has not been preserved for us, but it was obviously a ballad, and it is generally assumed, with every show of probability, that the said ballad was identical with the 'balet against plays' referred to in the *True Reporte*. Certainly we know of no other ballad which would tally with the description, and it may be noticed that the licensee Edward White was the publisher of Munday's *Discoverie of Edmund Campion*. But Mr Fleay has gone a step further than this and attributed the pamphlet as well as the ballad to Anthony Munday[2]. As this view has been called in question, in particular by Dr Thompson the most recent authority upon the puritans and the stage[3], it is worth while considering for a moment the reasons for and against the theory.

First of all, we have the similarity between the title of the tract and that of the ballad. This suggests a common author but does nothing more, since a ballad writer would be quite likely to steal or adapt a title from a book that had recently appeared. We should rest our argument rather upon the words already quoted from Gosson. *The Second and Third Blast* was an important book. It was the first book that had been entirely devoted to attacking the theatre. It was obviously inspired by the civic authorities and even bore the arms of the corporation on its title-page. It would be impossible that Gosson, who followed the battle between player and puritan very closely, could have been ignorant of its existence. Now the author of the *Third Blast* (the *Second* was a translation from Salvian) expressly informs us that he had been 'a great affecter of that vaine Art of plaie making,'

[1] Hazlitt, *English Drama and Stage*, p. 212.
[2] *History of the Stage*, pp. 51, 52.
[3] *Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage*, New York, 1903, pp. 68, 86—7.

to which the editor of the book adds the remark: 'Yea...as excellent an Autor of those vanities, as who was best[1].' When therefore Gosson tells us that besides himself no playwright had ever written against plays except one, we are forced to conclude that he is referring to the author of the *Third Blast*, and when he goes on to say that the man had afterwards gone back to work for the stage once more, we are inevitably reminded of the words of the *True Reporte*. Munday had not only acted but written plays, and the story of the 'extempore play' supplies a motive for a temporary disgust with the stage. The city was at this time setting on foot one of its great campaigns against the theatre, and would probably be ready to pay for a tract written on its side of the question. Everything in fact points to Munday as the author of the *Third Blast*, and provides ample reasons for his authorship. Finally, the similarity between the titles, taken together with Gosson's definite statement that only *one* person connected with the stage had written against it beside himself, indicate that the ballad and the tract were from the same pen.

The only argument against the theory is that Munday returned to the stage in 1580, and therefore could not have written the *Third Blast* at the end of that year. But this argument, if valid, would be equally telling against Munday's authorship of the ballad, which no one seems inclined to dispute. The objection seems to rest upon Munday's description of himself as 'a servant of the Earl of Oxford,' in *A Viewe of Sundry Examples*, printed in 1580. To this it may be replied first, that the year at that time was generally reckoned as ending not on the 31st December, but on the 25th March following, so that there would have been plenty of time for Munday to repent of his repentance and 'return to his vomit' before the year ran out; secondly, that 'servant of the Earl of Oxford' does not necessarily imply that Munday was a member of the Earl's acting company. The Earl of Oxford was very free with his patronage, and at this time attracted many young men into his service, and among them John Lyly, who was apparently engaged in secretarial work[2]. It is in any case absurd to credit Munday with the ballad licensed November 10 and refuse to admit that he could have written the *Third Blast*, licensed October 18.

That a man like Munday should be pressed into the city's service to write against the stage is a curious commentary upon the general conduct of the puritan campaign.

[1] Hazlitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 101.
[2] See the present writer's *John Lyly*, pp. 7, 28.

II. The Marprelate Controversy.

That Munday had not in reality the slightest sympathy with the puritan cause is shown by the part that he played in the Marprelate controversy—a chapter in his career that has, I believe, hitherto passed unnoticed. The author of *An Almond for a Parrat* (spring, 1590), the last of the replies on the episcopal side to the Marprelate tracts, bids Martin 'beware Anthony Munday be not euen with you for calling him Iudas, and lay open your false carding to the stage of all mens scorne[1].' This may perhaps be read as a threat to renew the anti-Martinist plays which had been suppressed in the autumn of 1589, and it has been suggested that the threat was actually carried into effect in the form of *A Merry knack to know a knave*[2]. The words of *An Almond* were, in any case, a reply to one of Martin's flings in *The Reproof of Martin Junior* commonly known as *Martin Senior*. On sig. A 2^{v} of this Martin gives us 'an oration of Iohn Canturburie to the pursuivants, when he directeth his warrants unto them to post after Martin.' Anthony Munday is the first pursuivant to be addressed, and the following words are put into Whitgift's mouth concerning him: 'I thanke you Maister Munday, you are a good Gentleman of your worde. Ah thou Iudas, thou that hast alreadie betrayed the Papistes, I thinke meanest to betray vs also. Diddest thou not assure me, without all doubt, that thou wouldest bring mee in, Penry, Newman, Waldegrave, presse, letters, and all, before Saint Andrewes day last. And now thou seest we are as farre to seeke for them, as euer we were.' From this it is obvious that Munday was still engaged as a pursuivant, and was one of the chief police agents set on to Martin's track.

As it happens, we possess a little picture of Munday in the exercise of his profession. On December 6, 1588, one Giles Wiggington, who was suspected to have had a finger in the Marprelate pie, was summoned to Lambeth to answer for himself. The 'archbishop's pursuivant' who 'apprehended him at his lodgings, while he was in bed,' was none other than our hero. They took a boat to Lambeth and on the way Munday, under pretence of desiring to be instructed, induced his prisoner to speak unguardedly of his opinions, and of what he knew concerning Martin, all of which was of course carefully reported to the archbishop when they reached Lambeth, although a strict promise of secrecy had been given to the simple-minded puritan minister[3].

[1] McKerrow's *Nashe*, III, p. 374, l. 22. [2] Thompson, *Puritans and the Stage*, p. 200.
[3] For Wiggington's account of this episode see a volume of manuscripts entitled *A Second Part of a Register*, pp. 843—849 (Dr Williams' Library).

Since Munday has thus been proved beyond all possibility of doubt to have been engaged in tracking the Marprelate press in its movements across the country, he may I think with every show of probability be supposed to have also taken part in the production of the anti-Martinist tracts. It would be strange indeed if a man of his literary reputation and ability had not written something upon a matter which must then have occupied so much of his thoughts, especially as the bishops were at this time ready to encourage, and probably to reward, those who took up the pen against their formidable antagonist. Munday, we may be almost certain, was one of the little group of anti-Martinist writers, and the only difficulty is to point to the pamphlets that came from his pen. In this Martin himself gives us a clue, somewhat vague it is true, but worth stating for all that. On page 25 of the *Protestation* the following sentence occurs, 'then among al the rimers and stage plaiers, which my Ll of the cleargy had suborded against me, I remember Mar-Martin, John a Cant. his hobbie-horse, was to his reproche, newly put out of the morris, take it how he will; with a flat discharge for euer shaking his shins about a maypole againe while he liued.' Martin is speaking of his tract *More Worke for the Cooper*, which had just been captured with the printers and press, and is drawing upon his memory for its various points and sallies. It is clear from his words that as a retort to the anti-Martinist plays he had written what he would perhaps have entitled 'a pageant of petty popes,' and that Mar-Martin had figured in this as giving some performance at which he was hissed off the stage. The word 'newly' is curious and cannot in this connection mean 'recently,' since Martin is not referring to any actual occurrence. We must therefore, I think, give it its other meaning of 'again,' or 'anew,' and suppose that Martin is hinting at some occasion in which Mar-Martin had really been disgraced upon the boards of a theatre. Such an incident would be the very thing that Martin would pounce upon and turn to his own ends. I suggest, therefore, that the incident in question is that referred to in *A True Reporte* and that Martin identified Mar-Martin with Anthony Munday. The epithet 'John a Cant. his hobbie-horse,' which is obviously suited to the archbishop's pursuivant, lends some additional support to the theory[1].

Assuming then the identification to have been intended and to have been correct, what did Munday write in support of the bishops against Martin? There are of course the rhymes which appeared in

[1] Martin had already, it will be remembered, referred to Munday's treachery against the Papists. It is not impossible therefore that he had read *A True Reporte*.

the spring of 1589 under the title of *Mar-Martine,* but I fancy that Martin's reference to the morris and the maypole point to the fact that 'Mar-Martin' had been also engaged in the anti-Martinist dramatic work which made its appearance on the London stage in the summer of 1589. The author of *Martins Months minde* tells us that Martin had been 'made a may game upon the stage,' and gives the Theater as the place of performance[1]. Martin's words would lead us to conjecture that Munday either wrote this piece or took a prominent part in it as an actor. I am inclined to believe also that Munday had a hand in the prose anti-Martinist tracts that followed the dramatic attack. Mr McKerrow has made certain discoveries, which we hope to see set out in the fifth volume of his magnificent edition of *Nashe,* that make it highly improbable that Munday any more than Nashe could have been responsible for the tracts that passed under the name of Pasquil. Nashe certainly took some part in the controversy, for we have his own word for it. Perhaps he merely contributed to the dramatic replies, perhaps he was the author of the amusing *Martins Months minde.* This would leave by process of exhaustion *An Almond for a Parrat* for Munday, the very tract, be it noticed, which gives a resentful reply to Martin's reference to him as Judas. None of the other pamphlets show such a remarkable knowledge of the Marprelate business, and moreover the kind of knowledge it displays is just that which a pursuivant engaged in detective work would be likely to have gleaned. But what converts a possibility into a strong probability is the fact that the author of *An Almond* once distinctly speaks of himself as Mar-Martine: 'I giue thee but a bravado now, to let thee knowe I am thine enemie; but the next time you see *Mar-Martine* in armes bidde your sonnes and your familie prouide them to God-warde, for I am eagerly bent to reuenge, & not one of them shall escape, no, not T. C. himselfe as full as he is of his myracles[2].' This passage should be sufficient to convince anyone that *Mar-Martine* and *An Almond* are by the same hand, and it is hoped that the foregoing argument will be held sufficient to show that the hand in question was that of Anthony Munday. It only remains now to identify the personality of Pasquill and we shall be in a fair way towards clearing up the most teasing and obscure section of a teasing and obscure subject, the authorship of the anti-Martinist tracts in the Marprelate controversy.

John Dover Wilson.

Cambridge.

[1] Sig. E 3.

[2] McKerrow, *Nashe*, p. 350, ll. 6—10.

AN ANGLO-FRENCH LIFE OF SAINT PAUL THE HERMIT.

In one of his opening lectures at the Collège de France, the late Gaston Paris[1] classified the extra-national sources from which medieval French literature derived inspiration under four heads: classical antiquity, Christian legend, Celtic tradition and Indian stories, and showed how each class had enjoyed its period of popularity. For the last class he pointed out that a story, originating in India and under Buddhist influence, may be traced through Persian, Syrian, Arabic, Hebrew and Latin before arriving at French and that the reason for the popularity of these stories lay in the excellence of their moral teaching. In an excellent paper on *The Hermit and the Saint*, Mr Gordon Hall Gerould[2] shows the difficulty of tracing these Oriental stories but adds: 'In cases where the story was adopted by the Christian Church at an early date for the moral or religious instruction of its adherents, there is perhaps less difficulty than elsewhere in believing that it was actually transplanted from the East, since the lives of the hermits of the desert, those reservoirs of Christian example, were strongly tinged by Oriental thought. This latter kind of narrative,' that of *The Hermit and the Saint*, 'is well illustrated by the tale of the hermit who, after years of austere living, discovers that another man, though surrounded by wealth and clothed with temporal authority, has become his equal or superior in righteousness. The discomfiture of the good man when he learns that the essential character of holiness lies rather in humility and simplicity of heart than in outward show of piety gives the story point. Though obscured in some of the versions, it bears evidence that asceticism, even when it fell upon degenerate

[1] Dec. 1874. Reprinted in *La poésie du moyen-âge*, 2e série, p. 75 seq.

[2] *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. xx, No. 3, p. 529 seq.

days, sometimes remembered the meaning of true piety. The narrative thus furnishes a refreshing contrast to the multitude of tales in which morbid laceration of spirit and flesh are commended at the expense of more useful virtues.'

No less than five of this kind of story are to be found in the *Vitæ Patrum* attached to the lives of as many hermit saints of the desert: (1) Paul the Hermit, a version of which is the subject of this paper; (2) St Macarius, introduced by William of Waddington into his *Manuel des Pechiez* and published with Robert of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne* (E. E. T. S., 119); (3) St Paphnutius, an Anglo-French version of which, edited by the writer of this paper, is to appear in *Romania* for July, 1909; (4) Pyoterius, and (5) Eucharius, which do not seem to have found their way into French literature[1]. The story of Paul and Anthony does not seem to have the same point as the other stories since the piety of the hermits is of the same kind. It is only St Anthony who would appear to have grown proud of his own goodness (see below, l. 152) and to have been sent to find his superior in piety.

There was apparently in the Early Church some controversy about the question who was the first hermit, some declaring for Paul and some for Anthony; the legend as it stands in Migne (XXIII, col. 17 ff.) declares: *Paulum...principem istius rei non nominis* and states that the story of Anthony was much more widely known. In the *Legenda aurea*, Jacobus a Voragine follows Saint Jerome (*Paulus primus eremita ut testatur Hieronymus qui ejus vitam conscripsit*) who is in turn followed by the French prose version in the British Museum MS. 17275 Add. (fo. 204 vo. b) while the account in Migne is closely followed in the three following MSS.: (1) Paris, Bibl. nat. 412 (fo. 197 vo. b), (2) Cheltenham, Phillipps 3660 (fo. 212 vo. b), (3) British Mus. Royal 20 D. VI (fo. 196 vo. a)[2].

[1] A somewhat analogous case is furnished by the life of Saint Mary of Egypt whose story was apparently interwoven with that of Saint Zozimas to prove that the life-long asceticism of a monk could be surpassed by the abnegation of a woman.

[2] How closely these two groups are followed by the French prose may be seen by comparing them with the original Latin:

Legenda aurea.

Paulus primus eremita, ut testatur Hieronymous, qui ejus vitam conscripsit, fervente Decii persecutione eremum vastissimum addiit ibique in quadam spelunca lx annis hominibus incognitus permansit.

Brit. Mus. 17275 Add.

Saint Pol le premier hermite alsi com tesmoingne Saint Jheroisme qui escrit sa vie, s'en ala en .l. desert gaste, a cel temps que Decius Cesar emperere de Romme vivoit et destruisoit les crestiens. Illuec demora S. Pol lx ans que il ne vit home ne fame.

The rimed version here given has, however, no controversial intention; it is purely didactic and belongs to the vast mass of Anglo-French moral literature of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries (cf. Schofield, *English Literature from the Conquest to Chaucer*, ch. II and III, and appendices). Fortunately its author names himself at the end of his poem for the reason that has so often preserved a work from anonymity, that he might obtain credit in another life. He is doubtless that 'Boioun' whose *Contes moralisés* have been accorded an edition such as they deserve in the publications of the Société des anciens textes français. Mention is there (p. xlvii) made of nine verse lives of holy women ascribed to him, contained in MS. Cotton, Domitian XI. The following life of Paul the Hermit together with that of St Panuce bring the total up to eleven. In a previous note in this review (III, p. 374) I described briefly the MS. (Welbeck ICI) which contains these lives and in my article in the *Romania* a full account has been given; besides the two already mentioned, this MS. has a life of St Elisabeth of Hungary (also in the Cotton MS.) due also to the pen of Bozon as the learned editor of the edition of the *Contes* prefers to call him. Our author had doubtless access to a MS. of the works of Saint Jerome (referred to in the notes as H.) for he mentions him in line 285 and follows him fairly closely. In some cases however he would seem to prefer the shorter rendering of the *Legenda aurea* (quoted in the notes as L.a.). The former on account of his very digressions would be dear to the heart of Bozon.

As to the text here presented, it seems fitting to point out that faulty lines have been emended as far as possible. There is no doubt that Anglo-French authors meant to write correct lines and also that they were conscious of their imperfections; an insular pronunciation had, however, developed and it is to this that must be ascribed the majority of the divergences from the French of the continent. Further

Migne, XXIII, col. 17.

Inter multos sæpe dubitatum est a quo potissimum monachorum eremus habitari cœpta sit. Quidam enim altius repetentes, a beato Elia et Joanne sumpsere principium; quorum et Elias plus nobis videtur fuisse, quam monachus: et Johannes ante prophetare cœpisse quam natus sit. Alii autem, in quam opinionem vulgus omne consentit, asserunt Antonium hujus propositi caput, quod ex parte verum est: non enim tam ipse ante omnes fuit, quam ab eo omnium incitata sunt studia.

Brit. Mus. Royal 20 D. VI.

Assez de genz ount sovent doute qui fu li premiers hermites qui premierement habita es forez. Car li aucun dient que Seinz Helyes e Seinz Johans furent chief e commencement de tel maniere d'ordre. De cez ij nos semble il que Seinz Helyes fu plus que hermites e Seinz Johanz profetizaençois qu'il fust nez. Li autre tesmoignent que Seinz Antiones fu chief de tel maniere d'ordre et a cels se consent toz li peuples e ce est voirs en une maniere. Il ne fu pas del tot li premiers qui entra es deserz mes il dona premierement essample au monde. (fp. 195 vo. a.)

the scribe often endeavoured to take his share of the credit by rendering a verse more comprehensible to the frequent detriment of the scansion[1]. Cases where it is necessary now to count and now to omit the 'e muet' in order to secure the correct number of syllables in a line have not been pointed out in the notes.

LA VIE DE SEINT PAUL LE HERMITE.

Le primer hermite ke ay trovée,
Seint Paul le hermite est nomée;
il fut en tens le emperoür
Decius, un tourmentoür,
ki tourmenta les cristïens,
diversement, diverses genz.
a cele houre deus juvenceus,
deus crestïens, bons e le[e]us,
furent pris e aresounée,
si *vuelent* guerpir (la) crestientée.
nay, *firent* il, avaunt la mort
nus ellisoun ke fere teu tort.
fors pristrent l'un e l'unt lyé
a une ostache e flaelée,
taunt ke il fut ensaunglauntée,
pus soun cors de mel unt frotée.
le solail ardaunt soun cors ard;
les mousches le assailent de tote part,
quele peyne il souffry lors,
nul ne le sout for [le] soun cors.

10 MS. *voleyent*; 10 *crestientée* is generally of 4 sylls. 11 MS. *fount*.

1—4 The beginning seems rather to be suggested by the *Legenda aurea* (Ed. Graesse, 1850) *fervente Decii persecutione*, while the order is rather that of Hieronymous (Migne, XXIII, col. 19). 5—24 H. *Perseverantem in fide martyrem, et inter eculeos laminasque victorem jussit melle perungi, et sub ardentissimo sole, religatis manibus post tergum, reponi, scilicet ut muscarum aculeis cederet, qui ignitas sartagines ante superasset.*

[1] Of the various verse versions of the life of Saint Mary of Egypt, no less than six complete MSS. are extant of one of them and in each case the scribe has added an ending of his own.

pur tote la peyne ne poyent mye,
fere le graunter renerie;
ben vesquit [il] e ben morut,
hore ly turne tut a dedut.
soun cunpaynoun ausi le[e]us,
ausi estable mes plus beus,
de assez plus ad il souffert,
diverses paynes saunz desert,
e par arsoun e par [grant] freyt;
mes par tut [ceo] mestre esteit.
kaunt Sathan perd(y) par la sa preye,
yl le assailli par autre veye.
en un verger delicious,
il le unt amenee par desouz
les arbres fuyllez e floriez,
hou oyseus fount lur melodiez,
hou se espanit le douz odour
de rose e liz e autre flour,
hou les riveres encountreyent
ke le verger envirouneyent,
partut enclos de beu treleys,
e ben frettee de beu foylliz,
la feseyent fere un lit,
ben covert de [un] beu samyt;
e unt cogee ly juvenceous,
en [i]ceo lyt ke fu si beus,
[e] meynz e piz ly unt lyée
de laz de seye ben afforcée;
e pus s'en sount [tres]touz allée,
e meyntenant [s'est] reveé[e],
femme en beaute graciouse,
mes en malice venimouse;

31 the line might perhaps be better emended by omitting *par.* 50 The verb *reveer* is apparently rare; Godefroy only quotes one example of the reflexive use and that quite late (s.v. *revoiier*).

---

21 The death of this first martyr is only suggested in the *cederet* and is not mentioned in L.a. 33 H. *in amœnissimos hortulos.* 38 H. *inter lilia candentia et rubentes rosas, cum leni juxta murmure aquarum serperet rivus.* 44 H. *super exstructum plumis lectum.* 48 H. *blandis sertorum nexibus.* 50 H. *Quo cum, recedentibus cunctis, meretrix speciosa venisset.* The picture is touched up to suit his age.

la bele mauveyse le beysa,
e vileynement le manya,
des braz souvent le embraza
e mout *vilement* le tempta.
yl senty sa char eschaufer,
e il ne se pout deliverer;
sa launge demeyne ad coupée
de ses denz e [l'ad] escoupée
en my la face [la] vileyne,
ki [la] ly feseit taunt de peyne;
ele vit sa bountee taunt parfite,
fors s'en ala [tote] desconfite;
e par dolour de la [soue] launge,
sa temptaciun devynt estraunge;
en cele bataille demora mestre,
pur joye durable hou voleyt estre;
par mort passa a cele vie,
hou *tout* est joye e melodie.
Seint Pol ke tut veu aveit
ke de *ceus* amiz dounk esteyt,
tere e mesoun e heritage,
tut guerpit il e soun lingnage;
e [il] se myt en un desert,
hou nul homme [ne] se aherd;
la se quisit hou poüt meyndre,
hou autre ne quidout ke put ateyndre:
en une roche prive[e]ment,
ke tut enviroune espessement
bronce, espines mout poynaunz;
e la demora sessaunte aunz;
unk(e) de lu remuher ne vout,

56 MS. *forment.* 70 MS. *hou joye est touz jours e melodie.* 72 MS. *cesse.*

57 H. *Quem tormenta non vicerant, superabat voluptas.* 59 H. *Tandem cœlitus inspiratus, præcisam mordicus linguam in osculantis se faciem exspuit.* 71 Both Bozon and L.a. omit Paul's retreat to a lonely farm and the dreaded treachery of the brother-in-law, who desired Paul's property (*sororis maritus cœpit prodere velle quem celare debuerat*). L.a. has briefly *Horum et altorum pœnis sanctus Paulus territus eremum petiit.* 79 Hieronymous' long digression on the nature of the cave—a disused coiner's den of the time of Cleopatra and Antony—is omitted. 82 Cf. L.a. passage quoted p. 492, note. H. *cum jam centum tredecim annos beatus Paulus vitam cœlestem ageret in terris.*

ne unkes homme de ly ne sout:
taunt ke advynt ke Seint Antoynne
ke *esteit* un tres noble moynne,
resceüt en avisïun,
ke il alat ver un teus houn.
Seynt Antoynne se myt avaunt,
ne sout queu part [ne] taunt ne kaunt;
mes grace le amena por *son* desert,
le dreyt chemyn a ceu desert.
kaunt est entre en la guastine,
se meit la undreit hou Deu destyne.
une beste [par] trop hidouse,
l'ad encountre si merveillouse,
ke homme e cheval sount enclos
en la figure de un soul cors;
pur cele vue sauvagine,
yl fit la croiz en sa poitrine;
avaunt se myt [mout] baudement,
en Deu se affia (mout) leüment;
pus encountra une autre beste,
ke par devaunt out meyns e teste
en fourme de homme apparisaunt,
mes par derere out semblaunt
de chevre, en quyse, en nage, en pée;
assez esteit il deguysée.
yl tendy Antoyne l'une mayn,
de frut de paume tote pleyn,
de l'autre meyn [il] ly mercheyt,
cele part hou l'ermite maneyt.
ky estes vos? dit [Seint] Antoyne.
yl respondi au noble moynne:
jeo su, dit il, un deu du boys,
nut e jour par icy [jeo] voys,

86 MS. *fut.* 91 MS. *sa.* 107 *quyse* does not seem to be found in the dictionaries; it would seem to be *cuisse*; *nage* (=*fesse*).

87 H. *hæc in mentem ejus cogitatio incidit, nullum ultra se perfectum monachum in eremo consedisse.* L.a. *Eo tempore cum Antonius primum se inter monachos eremicolam cogitaret.* 97 H. and L.a. *hominem equo mixtum.* 104 H. *haud grandem homunculum videt, aduncis naribus, fronte cornibus asperata, cujus extrema pars corporis in caprarum pedes desinebat.* 110 H. *palmarum fructus...offerebat.*

jeo su mortel, de mort mourray,
le comun Deu priez pur mey.
pus [il] encountra un grant lou,
unke mes ne out un tel(e) v[e]u;
le lou fit seingne de la couhe,
ke ly seint homme fu ben venue;
touz jours [il] ala devaunt ly;
e seint Antoyne le suhi;
pensa de Deu ke le out cher,
(le) lou envea pur l'amener.
kaunt aprocherent a tel lu
ke Seint Pol [i] out ell[e]ü,
de nule part ne ad trovée,
veye ne sent ke fut usée.
le lou le ameyne par my la bronce,
hou il passa par mainte rounce;
a graunt peyne illuke vint,
ne hoseit entrer, dehors se tynt.
le lou a Seint Pol i entra,
e Antoyne dehors demora;
par le lou apparceüt tot,
ke estraungerie ly fu desc[l]ost
tot meyntement soun hus [il] clot
e clos se tynt, ne dit nul mot.
Seint Antoyne [resta] par de hors;
a tere chey e dit lors:
beu douz pere, taunt [seyez] benyngne,
mes ke jeo ne seye pas digne
de veer la face aungeline,
sa graunt bountee ver mey encline;

138 MS. *descost*: this would seem to be an incorrect past participle, cf. l. 97.

117 H. *Mortalis ego sum et unus ex accolis eremi, quos vario delusa errore Gentilitas, Faunos, Satyrosque vocans colit. Legatione fungor gregis mei. Precamur ut pro nobis communem Dominum depreceris....* 121 L.a. has simply: *Postremo obviavit ei lupus, qui eum ad cellam sancti Pauli perduxit.* H. remarks that the wolf entered the cave to quench its thirst and that Antony followed it. Neither author mentions the sign of the tail but it is a touch worthy of a writer who used beast stories to such an extent in his *Contes* (v. *op. cit.* p. 64 *et freq. al.*). 134—9 Both H. and L.a. state that St Paul barred the door: *Paulus ostium sera clausit.* H. *Paulus ostium quod patebat occludens sera obfirmavit.* 145 H. *Scio me non mereri conspectum tuum.*

ne souffrez pas ke jeo ne eye
mon desir e ke [jeo] vos veye:
avaunt ke venise a vos cy,
Deu me moustra la sue mercy
en [un] apert avisïoun,
e vostre vie e vostre noun.
ky estes vos ke la parlez?
ja sessaunte aunz en sount passez
ke jeo oyse nul parler,
si aunge(l) ne fut hou seint du ciel.
jeo su Antoyne, ceo dit il,
un cheytif moynne ke en peril,
su venu cy pur visiter,
vostre persone ke Deu ad cher.
Seint Pol dounke li leit entrer,
se entrebeysent de douz quer:
lors se assistrent e parlerent
de douce matere ke la tresterent.
[e] Seint Pol pus li demaunda
de gent de secle coment va,
sount il uncore demorez
hou li secle est ja passez?
e il respond(i) la crestienté
commence a crestre, beneyt se Dé(e).
a ceo ke sistrent en parlaunt,
vint un oysel ke fu ben graunt,
ki port[eit] un payn tut enter,

155—6 This instance of assonance would not be as striking a fault as it would be on the continent; the value of *r* cannot have been very distinct; cf. the rimes, 97, 8. 170 The form *se*=(*seit*) may perhaps be kept in a formula like this, but the reduction *ei* > *e* is rare in Agn. though some instances are found in Domesday Book.

---

157 H. *Quo (ingressu) aperto dum in mutuos miscentur amplexus, propriis se salutare nominibus.* 165 *Narra mihi, quæso, quomodo se habeat humanum genus.* A similar human touch is to be found in a life of St Mary of Egypt:

Dic, quomodo nunc agitur cum gente Christiana? quid Reges agunt? quomodo gubernatur Ecclesia?
A.A.S.S. 1 April, p. 79.

mult li comence a demander,
e molt sovent a enterver,
des reis, des contes de le tere,
se il ont pais ou il ont guerre,
e des pastours qui le loi tienent
confaitement il se contienent.
MS. Paris, B.N. 23112.

entre eus deus le lut cheer.
lors dit Seint Pol a Seint Antoyne;
checoun jour a houre de noune,
Deu me ad done sessaunte aunz
par un oysel ma soystenance,
un demy payn [a] checun jour,
mes pur nos huy [a] iceo jour
nous est venu un payn enteer
par nostre courteys despenseer.
hore en pernez, dit Seint Pol;
nay, dit l'autre, jeo serrey fol,
si jeo meyse avaunt la meyn
avaunt ke husez pris du payn.
[mes] pus apres un long atent,
[y] mistrent meyn par un assent,
l'un e l'autre a iceo payn,
si ke nul ne fut le dereyn.
kaunt unt mangé, del ewe burent,
autre hanap ke meyns ne hurent;
e mercient lur creatur,
ke lur fit [un] si graunt honour.
dounk dit Pol jeo ay (mout) desirée,
de cheytif cors estre allegée;
ke jeo puse par taunt venir,
a moun seygnour ke taunt desir;
hor(e) say jeo ben ke tens aproche,
ke ly alme du cors se alloche;
par taunt ke estes venu icy,
par vos serray ensevely.
e Seint Antoyne respoundy
ne vuylle Deu ke fut issy.
hou vos touz jours ci demouray,
e de vos servir prest serray.

177—8, the rime would seem interesting for the pronunciation. 200 I know no example of *allochier* in Old Fr. but *eslochier* is very common in senses analogous to this: perhaps the line should be emended *s'esloche*; Bozon may possibly have written *asloche*, the change $e > a$ is not uncommon in Agn.

184 ff. H. *Hic vero quis frangeret panem oborta contentio, pene diem in vesperum duxit. Paulus more cogebat hospitii, Antonius jure refellebat ætatis. Tandem consilium fuit, ut apprehenso e regione pane, dum ad se quisque nititur, pars sua remaneret in manibus.* 192 *Dehinc paululum aquæ in fonte prono ore libaverunt.*

nay, dit l'autre, mouz de genz
serrount apres par vostre presens;
voirs ne devez pas desirer,
taunt soul vous meesmes sauver,
mes autry salu (de) procurer,
par ensaumple e par precher;
coment serrey(en)t la gent sauvée,
si ne fusent ben enfourmée:
hore alez tot, jeo vous [en] pri,
si me aportez le mauntel (i)cy,
ke l'*arce*veske Attanasy
vous ad donee, vostre amy;
si tot cum vous retournerez,
prest de ensevelir me troverez.
Seint Antoyne se enmervuillout,
coment Seint Pol du mauntel sout;
ver mesoun se myt bon e bel,
ho ly reporta le mauntel.
kaunt une journey fu de lu
hou Seint Pol esteit, [le] soun dru,
regard amount au firmament,
e veyt mounter ignelement,
une trebele cumpaignie
des aungeles, en ky bayllie,
l'alme Seint Pol fu bayllée
ke passa (le) solayl(le) en clartée.
lors Antoyne se hasta mout,
pur saver [moun] si Pol mort fut,
trova le cors ho joyntes meyns,

207 line too short; 208 line too long. I read 'many people will be (saved) by your being in the world' (not hidden in a cave). 217 A blank had been left by the scribe before *veske*, the reference is to the gift of a *pallium* by Athanasius to Anthony. 220 Read *troverez* as two sylls. 234 The expression *saver moun* occurs in the same author's *Vie de Saint Panuce*: cf. Molière, *Ça mon* (*Bourg. gent.* III. iii).

---

209 H. *Non debes, inquit* (*Paulus*), *quærere quæ tua sunt sed quæ aliena.* 217 H. *Quamobrem, quæso, perge, nisi molestum est: et pallium quod tibi Athanasius episcopus dedit, ad obvolvendum corpusculum meum, defer.* 221 H. *Stupefactus ergo Antonius, quod de Athanasio et pallio ejus audierat.* 225 H. *Cumque jam dies alia illuxisset, et trium horarum spatio iter remaneret, vidit inter angelorum catervas, inter prophetarum et apostolorum choros, niveo candore Paulum fulgentem in sublime conscendere.*

seaunt a genuz par dedeyns;
(il) quidout ke fut en oreysoun,
par seingne de graunt devociun,
meuz apparut [plus] vif que mort,
dount il resceüt graunt counfort;
pus apres kaunt [il] ad v[e]u
ke le corps ne se est m[e]u;
il sout dont ben ke il fu mort,
lors out double descounfort
ke il ne hut parle avaunt ho ly
. . . . . .
dount il poüt ensevelir.
si dolent fut ne sout ke dir.
a ceo s'en venent deuz lyouns,
dount prime out poür ly seint houns,
taunt ke vit ke [il] se cogerent
aupres du cors e weymenterent
la mort le seint en lur nature;
(e) pus s'en levent e (fount) ouverture,
de la pouhe [fount] en la tere;
si ben cum *estovereit* fere,
assez loung e assez parfount,
e pus apres cogez s'en sount
devaunt (Seint) Antoyne e por guerdon
quer(er)ent par seingne la beneyson;
lors Seint Antoyne a Deu dit:
beu douz syre, Jhesu Crist,

246 The scribe in omitting this line has committed the error known as *homoioteleuton*; the line doubtless ended also with the words *ho ly* and corresponded to the Latin *Contristabatur Antonius quod sarculum quo terram foderet, non haberet.* 254 The *fount* of this line belongs to the line following. 256 The MS. has *escoverent* or *estoverent*: I take it that the scribe has written *n* for *i* (one bar too many). 262 Line of only 7 sylls.

---

239 H. *Ac primum et ipse vivere eum credens pariter orabat.* 248 Another instance where a wild beast helps to bury a saint is to be found in the beforementioned life of Saint Mary of Egypt. Here one lion digs the grave in which Mary is placed by Zozimas and the lion. 250 H. *Et illi (sc. leones) quidem directo cursu ad cadaver beati senis substiterunt, adulantibusque caudis circa ejus pedes accubuere: fremitu ingenti rugientes,...eos plangere, quo modo poterant. Deinde haud procul cœperunt humum pedibus scalpere; arenamque certatim egerentes, unius hominis capacem locum foderunt. Ac statim quasi mercedem pro opere postulantes, cum motu aurium, cervice dejecta, ad Antonium perrexerunt manus ejus pedesque lingentes. At ille animadvertit benedictionem eos a se precari.*

saunz ke *seü*, cheer a tere
la fuylle de arbre ne ne pout fere;
vous savez ben ke jeo oy affere,
de eyde pur cety metre en tere;
a cestes bestes ke me unt eydée,
jeo vous pri ke seit allouhée.
les lyouns s'en vount peysiblement;
le seint du seint le cors i prent,
le mit en tere e le covery,
e sa cote prit [il] ver ly;
autre tresor ne [i] trova
for la cote ke Seint Pol usa;
ne hot ne pael ne poscenet,
ne toylle ne nape ne cotelet,
ne chaloun ne lyncel (ne poyns) desure,
pur sessaunte aunz ke fit la demure:
la dure roche esteit soun lit,
de herbe e mouse se coverit;
autre payn ja mes ne gousta,
fors ceo ke l'oysel aporta;
dount Seint Antoyne ren ne trova,
fors la cote ke il usa;
de cele cote Seint Jerome dit,
ke en latin sa vie descrit:
meuz vodrey, dit il, en atres

263 The emendation seems hazardous since the MS. has *fu*: *saunz ke* should be followed by a finite verb, but the author may have mixed the two constructions *saunz ke sachez* and *saunz vostre seu*. 275 The word here given might possibly be a variant of *poçonet*, a measure; but since all the other words are names of textile goods, I am inclined to take as *poncelet*: a stuff which might have been woven at one of the many French towns of the same or similar names (cf. Arras) and named after it: or since *poncel* = *pavot* (poppy) it might be a name given to a stuff from the colour of the dye (cf. *cramoisi*), or perhaps the word is *poinçonnet*, embroidered work. 277 *chaloun*: Godefroy gives no example of this word but says that it is a stuff formerly manufactured at Châlons-sur-Marne. *poyns*: I take as *pane* in *counterpane* formerly *counterpoint*, and *desure* in the sense of *on him, to cover him*, but a reading *de Sure*, = of Syria seems possible. 287 I take *en atres* in the sense of 'belongings.'

263—8. H. *Domine, sine cujus nutu nec folium arboris defluit, nec unus passerum ad terram cadit, da illis (sc. bestiis) sicut tu scis.* 274—8 The author has allowed his fancy to run away with him: mention is only made of course of the *cote* = *tunica* in H. 285 H. *Obsecro, quicunque hæc legis, ut Hieronymi peccatoris memineris cui si Dominus optionem daret, multo magis eligeret tunicam Pauli cum meritis ejus quam regum purpuras cum pœnis suis.*

la cote Paul ho ses benfez,
ke touz les reumes ke reys tenent
e touz les tresors ke a ceus partenent:
e si fut ele mout estraunge,
de menuz paumes saunz lange hou lange,
mes k'aunke la cote valut meyns,
en value passa ke fut dedeyns:
mes ceo est la fin e la soume,
vie de aungel out cel homne.
e jeo pri Deu pur sa bountée
ke mercy eit de humeyne lyngnée,
de frere Boioun ne eit pas dedeyn,
de cele vie ke est loynteyn. Amen.

---

292 H. (*tunicam*) *quam in sportarum modum de palmæ foliis ipsi sibi contexuerat.*

A. T. Baker.

Sheffield.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Some Early Middle-English Spellings.

There are two remarkable pieces of twelfth century English forming the respective conclusions of two manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon *Chronicle*, which exhibit extraordinary phonetic and orthographic features. These are most of them to be paralleled in other early Middle English documents, but the passages that I refer to present such a chaos of grammatical forms as is only to be found in specimens of a like character with the *Paternoster*, which I commented upon in the October number of the *Modern Language Review* for 1907. Professor Skeat has noted (see *Influence of Anglo-French Pronunciation upon Modern English*. 1901, p. 27) what he regards as Anglo-Norman scribal characteristics in the Laud MS. of the *Chronicle*, but he has not, as far as I am aware, called attention to the passages I will proceed to discuss.

The first of these occurs at the end of MS. C (= Cott. Tib. B. i) of the *Chronicle* and is a twelfth century addition to the annal for 1066. It runs:

[Þa Normen] flugon þa Englisca. Ða wes þer an of Norwegan þe wiðstod þet Englisce folc, þet hi ne micte. þa brigge ofterstigan, ne sige gerechen. Ða seite an Englisce mid anre flame. ac hit nactes ne widstod. ænd þa com an oþer under þere brigge. end hine þurustang en under þere brunie. þa com Harold Engla chinge ofer þere brigge, & hys furde forð mid hine, & þere michel wel geslogon. ge Norweis ge Flæming, & þes cyninges sunu Hetmundus let Harold faran ham to Norweie mid alle þá scípe.

While this extract contains several features that link it with other documents of similar age, such as the forms *wes, þet, brigge, ænd, michel, gerechen*, it has peculiarities of spelling and of inflexion which would satisfy the hypothesis that the writer's native tongue was not English. Such are the confusion in the notation of guttural and palatal consonants, in *micte, nactes* for *mihton, nahtes*; *chinge* by the side of *cyninges*; the erroneous final *e* in *seite* (= O. E. *scēat* 'shot'); *þere* for *þær*; *chinge*

used for the nominative; the collapse of inflexions seen in *Norweis* by the side of *Norwegan*; *micte* for *mihton*; *mid alle þá scípe* for *mid eallum þām scipum*. For *s* = *sc* in *seite*, cf. *soten* in Layamon (later text) 1876.

Two early occurrences of words are supplied by the forms *brunie* and *en under*. The former is not recorded before 1175 (Cotton Homilies), though *healsbryniȝe* occurs amongst the early twelfth century glosses on Aldhelm (ed. Napier, p. 147, line 418). In the present instance the direct source may well be the Old French *brunie* rather than the Icelandic *brynja*. The latter, *en under*, is pretty certainly intended for the preposition *anunder*, which has hitherto been exemplified only from the thirteenth century.

The second passage for consideration forms the concluding paragraph of MS. D (= Cott. Tib. B. iv) of the *Chronicle*; it is the annal for the year 1130, but is misdated MLXXX (for MCXXX), and records the failure of the rebellion of Angus, Earl of Moray. (See Mr Plummer's edition of Earle's *Saxon Chronicles*, vol. II, p. xxxii.) It is as follows:

Hér werþ Anagus ofsleien frám Scotta eére. & þer werþ micel weell ofsleigen. mid him. þer wes codes riþt gesochen on him for þet he wes all for swóórn.

We observe here certain features noticed in the *Paternoster* referred to above: the omission of *h* in *eére* for *here*; *iþ* for *ih* in *riþt*; *c* (= *k*) for *g* in *codes* for *Godes* (cf. *kult* for *gulte* in the *Paternoster*). We have also the interpolated vowel between a liquid and another consonant in *Anagus*, which may be paralleled by *ileke* for *ilke* (*Old English Miscellany*, p. 28), *arum* for *arm* (*Havelok*, 1982). Other noteworthy points are the use of geminated vowels to represent vowels originally short, in *eére* (O. E. *here*), *weell* (O. E. *wæl*) and *for suóórn* (O. E. *forsworen*); and the unusual spelling *werþ* for *wearþ*. The form *gesochen* would seem to be a positive blunder; Mr Plummer very plausibly takes it to be for *gerochen*, intended as the passive participle of *gewrecan* 'to avenge.'

There is also a point of syntax which calls for remark. The passage affords a much earlier instance of the conjunction 'for that' (='because') than has hitherto been recorded. The *Oxford Dictionary* gives it first from Ormin. But the question naturally arises, whether the instance before us is to be looked upon as genuinely representing contemporary usage, or is only due to the ignorance of a foreign scribe, who made the nearest approximation he could to the normal *for þæm* (*þon*, *þȳ*) *þæt*, *forþan* (*forþī*) *þet*.

The importance of the two passages here considered seems to be that they belong to the very earliest decades of the history of Middle

English, and probably show us the old language in the very act of breaking down in the hands of writers familiar only with the phonetic system of French.

C. Talbut Onions.

Oxford.

'To have one's raik.'

As a supplement to my note *An Unrecorded Reading in Piers Plowman* printed in the *Modern Language Review* for January, 1908, and in view of its having been challenged elsewhere, it may be well to record a third occurrence of this phrase which I have found in a northern poem of the fourteenth century relating to the Scottish wars and printed in the Rolls edition of Pierre de Langtoft's *Chronicle*, Vol. II, App. iv, p. 458:

So lange the lebard loves the layk,
wit his onsped your sped ye spille,
And lates the lion have his raike,
wit werke in werdl ase he wille.

C. Talbut Onions.

Oxford.

A Note on 'Exodus,' Ll. 56 ff.

oferfor he mid ðy folce fæstena worn,
. . . . . .
oð ðæt hie on guðmyrce gearwe bæron.
. . . . . .
nearwe genyddon on norðwegas,
wiston him be suðan sigelwara land, etc.

Blackburn, the latest editor of the O. E. *Exodus* (*Belles Lettres Series*), in his note on *guðmyrce* (p. 38) remarks that the mention of the Ethiopians in the above passage is not easy to explain, as the original has nothing to suggest it, and that the notion of the cloud as a shelter from heat occurs nowhere in the Scriptures. He suggests also that *guðmyrce*, which is usually regarded as an adjective, 'war-dusky,' here used as a substantive, 'Ethiopian,' is a derivative of *mearc* meaning 'warlike-borderer,' and supports his theory by citing *per viam deserti* and *in extremis finibus deserti solitudinis* of the original, and the words *mearchofu* 61, and *mearclandum* 67, which occur in the O. E. version. But the poet's mention of the Ethiopians is inseparably connected with his conception of the purpose of the cloud, and of the

geography of the country over which the Israelites were marching. To him the cloud was a 'canopy,' 'net,' 'sail,' spread by the Almighty over the hosts of Israel as a protection from the heat of the scorching sun of the Sun-folk's (*Sigelwara*) land, where the cliffs were burning hot, and the people dusky with the sun's heat, and to the confines of which, as he conceived, the Israelites had come in their flight before Pharaoh. The mention of a wilderness in the original should also be taken into account. It is evident that the poet took it to be a waste country bordering on the Ethiopian desert, which is mentioned in the following passage in Alfred's *Orosius* (p. 8, Sweet's edition): 'Affrica 7 Asia hiera landgemircu onginnað of Alexandria, Egypta burge, 7 ligeð ðæt londgemærc suð ðonan ofer Nilus ða ea, 7 swa ofer Ethiopica westenne oð ðone Suðgarsecg.'

The second element of the O. E. name *Sigel-hearwa* also, which designates an Ethiopian, still remains obscure. Does the whole compound mean 'one who despises the sun,' or less probably, 'one harassed by the sun,' *-hearwa* being related to O. E. *hyrwan*, 'to speak ill of anyone,' 'despise,' 'harass,' O. H. G. *harwian*, 'exasperare'? It is impossible to relate *-hearwa* to the second part of the plural form *Sigel-waras*, 'Sun-folk.'

O. T. Williams.

Bangor.

The Mythical Ancestor of the Kings of East Anglia.

The earliest genealogy of the East Anglian kings is that given in the Cotton MS. Vespasian B. 6, of the ninth century. Unfortunately the list occurs on what was apparently once the last page of the book, and the writing is rubbed and faint, especially towards the end of the pedigree.

Sweet (*Oldest English Texts*, 171) reads the last names as 'tyt . . . . r . ing . care . . uodning . uoden frealafing.' If the MS. is examined under a glass in a good light, the second and third names appear quite indisputably to be *casering caser*. The faint *ser* should be compared with the same combination of letters in *sergius* in the list of popes on fol. 107 b. There is no trace of any letter following the *r* of *caser*.

The Vespasian MS. accordingly confirms Florence of Worcester, who places Casere after Woden at the head of the East Anglian pedigree (ed. Thorpe, I, 249).

Casere is twice mentioned in *Widsith*: first as the Emperor of the East, *Casere weold Creacum*, and subsequently as the ruler *Wala rices*. The name Caesar must early have been familiar to the tribes of North Germany, and may have been introduced into the Old Anglian speech, as Hoops suggests (*Waldbäume und Kulturpflanzen im germanischen Altertum*, 1905, p. 569), through Anglian or Saxon mercenaries in Roman pay.

That an obscure coast tribe should have made Caesar the ancestor of their royal house, and have given him Woden for a father, throws, perhaps, some little light upon their outlook towards Rome. It may be paralleled by the fact that, already in the fourth century, the Burgundians claimed to be of Roman descent. (Ammianus Marcellinus, XXVIII, 5, 11, *quod iam indè a temporibus priscis subolem se esse Romanam Burgundii sciunt.*)

R. W. Chambers.

London.

English Tags in Matthew of Paris.

The following tags of English from the *Historia Minor* of Matthew of Paris[1] are in themselves of no particular interest. They bring forward no strikingly unusual forms; they neither prove nor disprove the contention that Matthew of Paris was an Englishman who shortly after the Norman Conquest spoke English easily. They do offer the suggestion, however, that a careful search of the Latin chronicles written in England at the time of the Middle English period might disclose bits of English embedded in the Latin, which would, perhaps, more nearly represent the spoken English of the time than do the conscious productions that we have, written, as they are, in a conventional literary form.

1. Entry for the year 1075[2]. 'Qualiter Dunelmensis episcopus interfectus est...Unus eorum...patria lingua insibilans dixit, *Sort red, god red, slea we þe bissop!*'

2. The Battle of the Standard, 1138[3]. 'Cum enim illis satirice dicitur lingua sua patria, *Yry, yry, standard.*'

Does *yry* = 'hasten' = *eire*? Compare the noun *eir*: *as ssipes wiþ gret eir come toward londe*, Robert of Gloucester.

[1] Matthaei Parisiensis *Historia Anglorum, sive, ut vulgo dicitur, Historia Minor*. Ed. Sir F. Madden. Rolls Series. 1866. 3 vols.

[2] I, 21—22. [3] I, 260.

3. One of the songs of the Flemish soldiers under the Earl of Leicester, 1173, was[1]

> Hoppe, hoppe, Wileken, hoppe, Wileken
> Engelond is min ant tin.

4. Bartholomew, Bishop of Exeter, 1161, in a dream heard[2] 'vocem puerilem hunc sermonem Anglice pronunciantem, *Riseth op, alle Cristes icorne, Levenoth ure fader of þis wrold fundeth.*'

5. 'Terraemotus'[3] is glossed 'quem Anglici patria lingua, *Erhdune* vocant.'

James F. Royster.

Chapel Hill, N.C., U.S.A.

Was 'Due Desert' Walter Devereux?

Professor Cunliffe's note on *Gascoigne and Shakespeare, Modern Language Review*, IV, 232, in which he suggests that 'Due Desert' denoted Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, finds confirmation in the allusion there to 'the Etimologie of his name.' The name Devereux as is well known, came from 'd'Evreux,' but to Elizabethan etymologists this easily resolved itself through the spelling 'Deureux' into 'd'(h)eureux,' with suggestions of 'success,' 'victory,' 'good hap,' etc. I do not know whether Edmund Spenser took the part of Silvanus at the Princely Pleasures in 1575, but he was for several years an occasional inmate of Leicester's London House, as he was later a dependent of the Devereux family there, and was doubtless very familiar with this 'Etimologie' of 'Deureux': so much so that in *Prothalamion* he transfers the 'due desert' compliment, the laurelled victory, and the 'heureux' etymology, from Walter to Robert Devereux, from father to son:

> Joy have thou of thy noble victorie,
> And endlesse *happinesse of thine owne name*
> *That promiseth the same.*

Let us turn back to Gascoigne's 'mysterious phrases': 'She dyd long sithens convert *Due Desert* into yonder same *Lawrell* tree. The which may very well be so, considering the *Etimologie* of his name, for we see the *Lawrell branch* is a token of triumph,' etc. It is not the Laurel branch, but *the triumph*, of which 'the Laurel, meed of mighty conquerors,' is a token, that is uppermost in the writer's mind. The phrase 'due desert' was of course in common use, e.g., *Mother Hubberd's Tale*, l. 777; and

[1] I, 381. [2] I, 312. [3] III, 20.

E. Hake's dedication of his translation of *The Imitation or Following of Christ*, 1568:

> Ist Princely race that brings the crowne of fame?
> Or due desert that hath the same assignde?

This particular instance of 'due desert' was Thomas Duke of Norfolk, who was beheaded in 1572, three years before Professor Cunliffe's 'Due Desert' had the misfortune to achieve a very dubious triumph in Ireland. There seems little doubt that Professor Cunliffe's identification of 'Due Desert' is correct.

H. Littledale.

Cardiff.

Ben Jonson and 'The Isle of Dogs.'

The part taken by Ben Jonson, as writer and actor, in *The Isle of Dogs*, to which I called attention in my notice of Mr Greg's *Henslowe's Diary* (*Modern Language Review*, IV, 411) perhaps helps to interpret the chaff of him in Dekker's *Satiromastix*, ll. 1513—1527:

> '*Tucca.* No Fye'st; my name's Hamlet reuenge: thou hast been at Parris garden hast not?
>
> *Horace.* Yes Captaine, I ha plaide Zulziman there.
>
> *Sir Rees ap Vaughan.* Then M. Horace you plaide the part of an honest man.
>
> *Tucca.* Death of Hercules, he could neuer play that part well in's life, no Fulkes you could not: thou call'st Demetrius Iorneyman Poet, but thou putst vp a Supplication to be a poor Iorneyman Player, and hadst beene still so, but that thou couldst not set a good face vpon't: thou hast forgot how thou amblest (in leather pilch) by a play-wagon, in the high way, and took'st mad Ieronimoes part, to get seruice among the Mimickes: and when the Stagerites banisht thee into the Ile of Dogs, thou turn'dst Bandog (villanous Guy) & euer since bitest therefore I aske if th'ast been at Parris-garden, because thou hast such a good mouth; thou baitst well, read, *lege*, saue thy selfe and read.'

Possibly Zulziman was Jonson's part in *The Isle of Dogs*; there is no reason why Solyman in *Solyman and Perseda* should, as is sometimes suggested, be meant. The reference to Paris Garden may confirm the view that *The Isle of Dogs* was played at the Swan in the Liberty of Paris Garden; or Dekker may only be jesting on the suitability of Jonson's temper to the 'game' of bear-baiting, ordinarily called 'the game of Paris Garden.'

E. K. Chambers.

London.

The Date of Fletcher's 'The Chances.'

Can anyone help me to resolve the apparent contradiction in the evidence as to the date of Fletcher's *The Chances*? The plot is taken from Cervantes's story of *La Señora Cornelia*. This was first published among the *Novelas exemplares* of 1613, and it is hard to see how Fletcher can have known it before that year, or even, if, as some scholars think, he was ignorant of Spanish, before the issue of the French translation of 1615. On this I am allowed to quote from a letter which Prof. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, than whom there can be no better authority, was kind enough to write me on December 9, 1908.

At least one of the *Novelas exemplares* was written long before 1613. In *Don Quixote* (Part i, Chapter 47) *Rinconete y Cortadillo* is mentioned, and, as the *Privilegio* of *Don Quixote* is dated September 26, 1604, this story must be dated earlier than this.

No doubt the *Novelas* were written at odds and ends of times, and very likely there is a great interval between the earliest and the latest of them. But there is no evidence to justify Watts in saying (p. 119) that the majority were written between 1599 and 1603. *La Gitanilla*, for instance, was clearly written after the transfer of the court from Valladolid to Madrid (January 20, 1606). The Marqués del Priego was evidently dead when the *Coloquio de los Perros* was written: so it must be later than September 2, 1606. And so with the rest.

As it happens, there is a dispute about the date of *La Señora Cornelia*. Rius, in his *Bibliografía crítica* of Cervantes's works (vol. II, p. 354), argues that it must be assigned to a date long before 1600, and Rius is an acknowledged authority. But, in my introduction to MacColl's translation of the *Novelas* I have tried to show that Rius is mistaken, and the drift of my argument is this. Rius's only reason for putting *La Señora Cornelia* so far back is that (as he alleges) Hardy dramatized this story about the year 1595. This seems a rash deduction from a passage in a letter at the beginning of vol. II of Hardy's *Théâtre* (Paris, 1625): 'Ce n'est qu'un bouquet bigarré de six fleurs vieillies depuis le temps d'une jeunesse qui les a produites.' Rius takes this quite literally, supposes that Hardy was born about 1570, and maintains that, *if* Hardy did translate *La Señora Cornelia* in his youth, the translation must have been made at latest in 1600. Therefore (he goes on) the original should be assigned to 1590 or thereabouts.

This implies that Hardy read the story in MS. But there is nothing to lead us to suppose that there was a MS. copy of the story floating about, or that Hardy could have read it, if he had met with such a thing. At any rate, he did not read the story in Spanish, but took it from the French translation of the *Novelas exemplares* published by Rosset and the Sieur d'Audiguier in 1615. Several small but significant details prove this. Rosset translates *La Gitanilla* by 'La belle Egyptienne': so does Hardy. Rosset converts the *corregidor* into a *sénéchal*: so does Hardy. And so on.

Accordingly—at least this is my contention—Rius's argument goes to pieces. There is not the least reason to think that *La Señora Cornelia* was written in 1590 or thereabouts. Judging by the style, I should guess it was written after *Don Quixote*—say, about 1606; but this is only a conjecture, and we really know nothing as to the date....

...I think we may reject as untenable the theory of some of the *Novelas exemplares* being circulated in manuscript before their publication in the autumn of 1613. If this had occurred, we should expect to find some traces of it in Spain. There are

many dramatic adaptations of the *Novelas exemplares* in Spanish after 1613, but none before. It is an expensive and tedious business to make copies, and Cervantes was too poor to pay for copies, and too busy earning his living at odd jobs to make the copies himself. There is no reason to believe that copies circulated in Spain: we should require overwhelming evidence to convince us that they circulated out of Spain. There is no blinking the fact that Cervantes was not at all celebrated till the first Part of *Don Quixote* appeared in 1605: and, to put it bluntly, he was not worth copying or robbing till that year.

Even after all allowance is made for one's natural revolt against the much over-worked hypothesis of manuscript transmission as a solution of literary problems, Prof. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's convincing argument seems to me wholly to forbid any assumption that *La Señora Cornelia*, whether written in 1590 or in 1606, was known to Fletcher before 1613 at earliest. On the other hand, there is a passage in *The Chances* which it is extremely difficult to assign to a later date than about 1609. This is the bit of dialogue between the Landlady and Peter, which begins on Act iii, Sc. 1, l. 4:

Landlady. I will know.
Peter. Ye shall, any thing
Lyes in my power: The Duke of *Loraine* now
Is seven thousand strong: I heard it of a fish-wife,
A woman of fine knowledge.
Landlady. Sirrah, Sirrah.
Peter. The Popes Bulls are broke loose too, and 'tis suspected
They shall be baited in *England.*

This does not come from *La Señora Cornelia*, and it would have had very little point, unless it had a topical point intelligible to an audience at the time of its presentation in England. But for the puzzle arising from the date of Fletcher's source, I should have had no hesitation in assigning it to 1609. The jest about the Pope's bulls in particular would have seemed an unmistakable echo of the controversies of that and the immediately preceding years. The Recusancy Act of 1606 had led to the issue of papal *brevia* in 1607 and 1608, condemning the action of those Catholics who took the oath of allegiance, and these in their turn to the *Apologia pro Iuramento Fidelitatis* published by James the First in February, 1608. This was anonymous, but the authorship became matter of common knowledge, and a Catholic reply was anticipated. The interest caused by the controversy is traceable in contemporary letters. Thus M. De la Boderie, the French ambassador in England, wrote in a despatch of June 22, 1608 (*Ambassades*, iii, 347), 'Cependant il vient de Rome, ce disent les Catholiques, une excommunication fulminante contre tous ceux qui ont fait ledit serment, ou le voudroient faire, qui achevera bien de mettre tous ces pauvres gens en proie.' Similarly, on February 14, 1609, John Chamberlain

wrote to Dudley Carleton (Birch, *Court and Times of James the First*, i, 87), 'The Pope hath written to the French King, complaining that our King misuseth him continually in table-talk, and calls him *Anti-christ* at every word, which doth so enrage his holiness, that some papists fear it may drive him to thunder and lighten with excommunication.' But the closest parallel to the gossip of *The Chances* is afforded by the following passage from Bishop Montague's preface to his edition of the *Works* of King James in 1616.

> After that the Apologie was out, his Maiestie diuerse times would be pleased to utter a Resolution of his; that if the Pope and Cardinall would not rest in his answere, and sit downe by it; take the Oath as it was intended for a point of Allegiance and Civill Obedience; Hee would publish the Apologie in his owne name with a Preface to all the Princes in Christendome; wherein he would publish such a Confession of his Faith, perswade the Princes so to vindicate their owne Power, discover so much of the Mysterie of Iniquitie unto them; as the Popes Bulles should pull in their hornes, and himselfe wish he had never medled with the matter.

The Apology was in fact answered by Bellarmine under the name of his chaplain Matthew Tortus in October, 1608, and in June, 1609, James fulfilled his threat by the issue of *A Premonition to all the most mighty Monarchs, Kings, Free Princes and States of Christendom.* Fletcher might well have adapted the royal jest to the purposes of his dialogue, at any time during the interval between the two books. The other allusion, to the forces of the Duke of Lorraine, would fit a date after the death of the Duke of Clèves and Juliers on March 25, 1609, when gossip was beginning to estimate the strength of the parties of Europe in anticipation of the Clèves war. Henri IV certainly hoped for the aid of the Duke of Lorraine, and sent De Bassompierre to ask for it in the course of the following August (*Mémoires*, i, 237). No doubt the strength of Lorraine may have come into question at other and later dates, but the development of Stuart politics in their relation to the Holy See does not suggest any other appropriate occasion for the references to bull-baiting, before Fletcher's death on August 29, 1625.

E. K. Chambers.

London.

Two Unpublished Letters to Goethe from an English Translator of 'Goetz von Berlichingen.'

Walter Scott's translation of *Goetz von Berlichingen*, which appeared in February, 1799, was followed within a few weeks by another version, almost unknown in literary history. The author, Rose d'Aguilar, afterwards Mrs Lawrence, published under the latter name a translation of Gessner's works in 1802, also a mythological anthology and some poetry. Her *Gortz von Berlingen*[1], as she calls the hero of the drama, bears witness to her enthusiasm rather than to her skill or conscientiousness as a translator. The following sentences from the Preface are perhaps worth quoting[2]: 'The author, the celebrated Goethe, is known throughout Europe by various literary publications, particularly by his Sorrows of Werter; a work beautiful in its separate pictures, though in its general tendency unfavourable to virtue and happiness, and which but for this fatal objection, might have ranked with the most successful efforts of modern genius....He whose taste is formed in the laws of the Greek or the French stage will scarcely tolerate the irregularities of Gortz of Berlingen: the disciples of Shakespeare and nature will give him welcome, and dismiss him with applause....This play was published in Germany about the year 1771. The author therefore could not in writing it, have any reference to the melancholy crisis in which Europe is at present involved. To prevent, however, any improper application, a few sentences are softened or expunged.'

In a note to the Dramatis Personae the translator justifies the liberties she has taken with the names of the characters. 'The name of Falkenhelm, which will be familiar to those who are well read in the German Romances of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, has been substituted for that of Weislingen, as more easy to English pronunciation. The translator has also ventured to change the appellation of Francis for that of Frederic [i.e., Weisslingens Bub], to avoid the confusion which three characters of the same name might have occasioned the reader.' The same principle has evidently led to other changes: Goetz von Berlichingen becomes 'Gortz of Berlingen'; Max Stumpf becomes 'Mark Sturt'; Metzler 'Meisner'; Jaxthausen, 'Yarthausen'; Liebetraut, 'Veritas.'

[1] *Gortz of Berlingen, With the Iron Hand.* An Historical Drama of the Fifteenth Century. Translated from the German of Goethe, the Author of Werter. Liverpool, printed by J. McCreery.

[2] I am indebted to the Editor of this *Review* for the following notes on the translation, a copy of which is in the British Museum.

The translation is exceedingly free and often inaccurate. In Act II Veritas' [i.e., Liebetraut's] song is omitted. The scene 'Im Spessart' is headed 'Yarthausen—the Dining Hall,' the translator having possibly read 'Spessart' as 'Speisesaal.' The most conspicuous addition is in the Vehmgericht scene, where the translator has evidently borrowed from those 'German Romances of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries' to which she refers in the above note. The scene is supplied with the following descriptive stage-direction: 'Midnight. Inside of a Ruined Chapel. (The storm is still heard raging without, and sweeping at intervals thro' the long ailes of the building. Partial and transient gleams of moon-light serve to discover the dismantled windows, the mouldering monuments, and the insignia of knighthood, swords, helmets, and escutcheons, which are displayed against the walls. In the back-ground is an altar sinking in ruins. Broken pillars, and fragments of images lie scattered around. The ruins are in many places overgrown with ivy, moss and weeds. Near the altar are two rows of seats. Upon the altar lie a dagger and a cord).'

The author sent her book to Goethe accompanied by a letter, which was followed, after some months, by a second. Both were preserved by the poet, and they are to be found in the Goethe-Schiller Archiv at Weimar, *Briefe an Goethe*, 1800, pp. 60 and 87.

September 20th, 1799.

Sir,

The following imperfect translation of a beautiful original is submitted to the author of Götz von Berlichingen as a testimony of the respect his genius commands, and a proof of the admiration his excellence inspires. *Distance*, like *time*, annihilates the constraint with which we are accustomed to speak of living authors, and in *England* I may speak of Goethe and of Shakespeare with equal unreserve, and praise, without the imputation of flattery, the writer who has imitated the beauties, and inherited the genius of our immortal Bard.

The youth and inexperience of the translator must be pleaded as an excuse for many inaccuracies and several errors in the following sheets; nor can I flatter myself that I possessed one requisite to encourage me to so arduous an undertaking, except an unbounded admiration of the beauties of the original, and an ardent desire to communicate them to the English Public: With *them* and with *you* it remains to decide how far I have succeeded in this difficult task.

I am, Sir, with great respect,
Yrs
Rose d'Aguilar.

Great George St. Liverpool.

Sir,

I have ventured to desire my translation of your celebrated Drama *Götz von Berlichingen* may be forwarded to you, not as a considering worthy your attention or perusal but merely as a tribute of respect and admiration, and as a slight acknowledgment of the unbounded pleasure *this*, and the rest of your works, have afforded me. I feel the greatest diffidence in submitting this translation

to your perusal; and am quite at a loss how to excuse the many errors and inaccuracies you will certainly perceive in it. With regard to the trifling and incidental *alterations* or rather *additions*, I have now and then been obliged to make, they were such only as I judged absolutely necessary to accommodate it to the English public, and to explain to the mere English Reader the force of many expressions and allusions to which it was impossible to give in a translation the form and dignity they possess in their original language. The youth and inexperience of the translator may be pleaded in excuse for many errors; as it was my first, so it will probably be my last attempt: for I was only induced to undertake so arduous a task by my extreme admiration of the original, and by the idea that the English Public might experience a *portion* of the pleasure I had enjoyed in the perusal of a work, which appears to me to possess more than any other Drama this country or Germany has produced, the characteristic traits of Shakespeare's genius; —and which certainly displays *his* accuracy in the delineation of character, and his powerful energy in awakening the passions. I will not intrude longer on your leisure, or indulge myself in expatiating further on the beauties of *this* and many others of your writings which I have dwelt on with pleasure next to rapture. You must have heard the language of panegyric till it has ceased to give you pleasure;— and it cannot be supposed that you could at any time have been flattered by the commendation of an obscure stranger. Yet I will hope that you will not reject this testimony of respect and admiration when you recollect, that among all those your country or your friends may have offered you, there cannot have been one tribute on whose sincerity you might more justly depend, or which can be supposed more totally free from every interested motive.

I am Sir
with great respect
Yours
Rose d'Aguilar.

March the 5th, 1800.

If you are so obliged as to favor me with your opinion of the translation, be so good as to direct to *the Translator* free under cover to Dr Currie, Liverpool.

F. Baldensperger.

Lyons.

'Macbeth' and 'Lingua.'

In his valuable *Notes on some English University Plays* in Vol. III, No. II, of this *Review* Prof. G. C. Moore Smith alludes to some 'dubious imitations of Shakespeare' in the University play *Lingua*, ascribed by Sir J. Harrington to Thomas Tomkis of Trinity College, Cambridge, and first published in 1607. Prof. Moore Smith's references are to passages in *Julius Caesar* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and to kindred lines in the Cambridge comedy.

I should like here to draw attention to two parallels between *Lingua* and *Macbeth*. If Tomkis is deliberately parodying Shakespeare, as is,

I think, probable, the passages in *Lingua* become of great importance. For they then form an additional link in the chain of evidence which connects the production of *Macbeth* with 1606. *Lingua*, as already mentioned, was first published in 1607; though it has been conjecturally assigned on internal evidence to an earlier date, the hypothesis is a very doubtful one. I would suggest that the play, the popularity of which is attested by six editions, was printed soon after it was written; and that the author, who shows a remarkable faculty of parodying varied literary and dramatic styles, included in it imitations of two passages in Shakespeare's recently acted tragedy.

Even, however, if this view is not accepted, and the resemblances between *Macbeth* and *Lingua* are looked upon as accidental, they are well worthy of notice.

In the Cambridge comedy, Lingua, who aspires to be reckoned among the Senses, seeks to provoke discord between them by means of a crown and royal robe which she lays in their path. Her page Mendacio declares that these gifts have been brought from heaven by Mercury. The plot, however, fails, and, in revenge, she stirs up fresh strife among her rivals through a drugged potion, which she obtains from the hag, Acrasia. To prevent bloodshed, Crapula in Act v, Sc. 10 summons Somnus whom he thus addresses:

> Soft sonne of night, right heyre to Quietnesse,
> Labours repose, lifes best restorative,
> *Digestions* carefull Nurse, blouds Comforter,
> Wits helpe, thoughts charm, the stay of *Microcosme*,
> Sweet *Somnus* cheefest enemy to Care:

Compare with these lines Macbeth's apostrophe, after the murder of Duncan:

> Sleepe that knits up the ravel'd Sleeve of Care,
> The death of each dayes life, sore Labors Bath,
> Balme of hurt Minds, great Natures second Course,
> Chiefe nourisher in Life's Feast.

Though, of course, in any detailed descriptions of sleep, some parallelism will be found, the close correspondence of idea and phraseology in the above passages is very remarkable, while the words '*Digestions* carefull Nurse,' compared with 'Chiefe nourisher in Life's Feast,' seem to give just the necessary touch of parody.

The other passage to which I wish to draw attention occurs in Scenes 17 and 18 of the same Act. Somnus has bound fast the Senses and Lingua, but they are talking in their sleep, while Phantastes and Heuresis stand by and listen. In the earlier part of the Scene the

Senses babble confusedly, one after the other; then the dialogue continues as follows:

Ling. Mum, mum, mum, mum.
Phan. St, sirra, take heede you wake her not.
Heur. I knowe sir shee is fast a sleepe, for her mouth is shutte.
Ling. This 'tis to venture upon such uncertainties, to loose so rich a Crowne to no end, well, well.

Phantastes then bids Heuresis fetch Communis Sensus and Memoria to hear Lingua's further utterances. Whilst they are being summoned, the scene proceeds:

Ling. *Mendatio*, never talke farther, I doubt 'tis past recovery, and my Robe likewise, I shall never have them againe, well, well.
Phan. How? her Crowne, and her Roabe, never recover them? hum, wast not said to bee left by *Memory*? ha? I conjecture here's some knavery—fast lockt with sleepe, in good faith. Was that Crowne and Garment yours *Lingua*?
Ling. I marry were they, and that some body hath felt, and shall feele more, if I live.
Phan. O strange, she answers in her sleepe to my question, but how come the Senses to strive for it?
Ling. Why I laide [it] upon purpose in their way, that they might fall together by the eares.
Phan. What a strange thing is this?

Then in Scene 18 Communis Sensus and Memoria appear, and Phantastes asks the sleeping Lingua further questions. In her answers she first takes him to be Mendacio and afterwards Acrasia, whom she thanks for the effects of her potion. She then, according to the stage-direction, '*riseth in her sleepe, and walketh.*' Thereupon Communis Sensus cries 'how's this, is shee asleepe? have you seene one walke thus before?' And Memoria answers, 'It is a very common thing, I have seene many sicke of the Peripatetick disease.' Communis Sensus inquires 'what should be the reason of it?' and Memoria gives a *quasi*-scientific explanation from Scaliger. Lingua, in reply to a further question, tells how she has used Acrasia's potion, and then lies down again, still asleep.

The remarkable resemblance between this episode and the 'sleep-walking' scene in *Macbeth* will, I think, be evident. In both cases a criminal heroine reveals in her sleep her guilty practices; in both she imagines herself to be conversing with the partner of her misdeeds, while she is in fact being watched and overheard by witnesses anxious to learn the true significance of her involuntary confessions.

But the resemblance is not confined to the general situation. It can be traced also in details of expression. Part of the strangely impressive effect of Lady Macbeth's utterances in her 'slumbery agitation' is due to the repetition of certain words and phrases. The

author of *Lingua* adopts the same device. Thus Lingua's four-fold 'mum, mum, mum, mum' sounds like a parody of Lady Macbeth's four-fold 'come, come, come, come' in her final speech. The Doctor in *Macbeth* murmurs 'well, well, well'; two of Lingua's speeches end with 'well, well.' Just after Lady Macbeth's entry the Doctor remarks 'you see her eyes are open,' and the Gentlewoman answers 'I but their sense are shut.' Is not this parodied in Heuresis' words, 'I knowe sir shee is fast a sleepe, for her mouth is shutte'? And as the Doctor ends the Scene with the confession 'My minde she has mated, and amaz'd my sight,' so Phantastes cries 'What a strange thing is this.'

But the most striking fact of all is that Lingua should not only talk in her sleep, but that she should rise and walk. This is in no way necessary to the plot of the Cambridge play, and it is difficult to see why it was introduced unless the author had Lady Macbeth in his mind.

I think that the reasonable inference from the whole evidence is that Tomkis had recently seen *Macbeth*, and was making good-humoured fun of parts of the tragedy. Otherwise we must conclude that by some extraordinary chance Shakespeare and the academic playwright invented about the same time situations and speeches so curiously akin.

F. S. Boas.

London.

DISCUSSIONS.

'Ahrimanes,' by Thomas Love Peacock.

All admirers of Thomas Love Peacock must needs be grateful to Mr A. B. Young for his publication of the unprinted poem, *Ahrimanes*, in the January number of the *Modern Language Review*. At the same time, it is impossible not to regret that Mr Young did not treat the sole authority for the poem—the author's holograph MS.—with somewhat greater care. And as Mr Young's text, backed by the high reputation of the *Review*, is likely to mislead future critics and editors, it will be well to have its more important errors corrected and its chief omissions supplied.

In Canto I, the word which Mr Young could not read in Stanza v is 'anarch,' and in Stanza xxvii the word is 'Great,' which should be followed by 'Ahrimane's' with an apostrophe before the final 's.'

In Canto II Mr Young gives thirteen stanzas only, and says nothing about the fourteenth, which he evidently overlooked. Peacock in this poem wrote one stanza on each side of each sheet of paper. Folio 25 of the MS. contains Stanza xiii—given by Mr Young. Folio 25 *verso* contains Stanza xiv. Folio 26 has the heading 'XV' for the fifteenth stanza, but no words. And on folio 26 *verso* is the beginning of that prose outline of the plot which Mr Young transcribes (p. 228 of the *Review*). His omission is the more curious, as the fourteenth stanza, which is not unfinished or inferior to the rest, must have been immediately before his eyes as he transcribed folio 26 *verso* below it; since the sheets on which *Ahrimanes* is written are only some two-thirds the size of the volume of MSS. in which they are bound up. The omitted stanza runs as follows:

XIV.

Far on the left the lessening rocks recede:
A plain extends, a wide luxuriant plain;
One fair expanse of grove and flowery mead,
And field, wide-waving with unripened grain;
Of industry and peace the blest domain!
The tinkling sheep-bell gave a pleasant sound;
And youths and maids were there, a cheerful train;
And rosy children gambolled on the ground,
Where peeped the cottage forth from many a sylvan mound.

Mr Young's verbal errors in *Ahrimanes* may be given, with least expenditure of space, in a list. The Roman numeral gives the stanza, the Arabic the line; the first word is Mr Young's, the second Peacock's.

Canto I, I 6 cliffs'—cliff's; VII 2 passed—pressed; VIII 1 music—music's; X 4 mossy—massy; XIV 9 soon—scorn; XX 2 death—dearth; XX 8 fields—field; XXI 6 peerless—waveless; XXIX 8 a—no; XXX 1 pale—parle; XXX 8 lovely—lonely.

Canto II, III 4 poison-clamp—poison-damp; III 7 steeds'—steed's; IV 6 moonlit—moonlight; VIII 6 mossy—massy. Also in Stanza XII, in the first alternative line given in the footnote, 'the heaven' should read 'to heaven.'

Mr Young omits a connecting hyphen between the following words:

Canto I, VII 4 ever-murmuring; IX 1 island-bowers; XXX 2 thickly-mantling; Canto II, XII 1 mountain-top; XII 4 light-trembling; and he inserts one in Canto I, XII 1 between 'barrier' and 'rock.'

Stops should be inserted as follows, where Mr Young has either the wrong punctuation or none at all:

A comma after Canto I, II 2 beam; III 4 Jet-black; VII 6 around; XIII 4 task; XVI 5 remote; XXV 4 names; XXIX 1 said; XXX 2 thickly-mantling; Canto II, I 3 man; I 6 hymn; I 8 displays; III 7 swords; VI 8 suffice; VIII 7 groves; X 6 free; XIII 1 expand.
A semi-colon after XXIX 2 amaze.
A colon after IX 5 knelt; Canto II, XII 1 mountain-top; XII 2 sway.
A full stop after VI 2 obeyed; XIII 5 shrine (before the dash); XV 7 bear; Canto II, XI 2 suspends.
A dash after III 9 rise (deleting the period), and Canto II, III 2 court (after the comma).
A period supplied by Mr Young after XXI 5 'imprest,' and a dash after 'poison-damp,' in Canto II, III 4, should be removed.

Mr Young prints, moreover, two verbal inaccuracies in the course of Peacock's note on the first stanza of Canto II—'form' for 'forms,' and 'inquisition' for 'inquisitor'—and he does not make it clear that the pencil erasure covers the last sentence only of the note.

A list of Mr Young's oversights in the rough draft of the poem, and his errors in transcribing it, would occupy too much space. Of the latter, perhaps the most curious are 'wildish' for 'wildest' (which he tentatively suggests), and 'long species' and 'applicants' for 'every species' and 'suppliants.' In his connecting remarks, by the way, on page 227 of the *Review*, he places Shelley's first meeting with Newton on August 5, 1812—three months before it actually took place.

The mistakes and omissions in Mr Young's text of poem and draft speak for themselves. It may seem, however, that I have been over nice in giving so long a list of mis-punctuations in his version of the

former. I can only urge that the MS. of *Ahrimanes* is a fair copy, and finished so far as it extends; and that I have corrected Mr Young's errors only where they had a distinctly bad influence upon either the sense or the run of the poem. Had I included also those deviations which, though they are to be deprecated in a presumably faithful text, do not actually stultify the author's intention, the list would have been greatly swelled. I have passed over also Mr Young's minor divergencies in spelling, and his somewhat autocratic treatment of Peacock's text in the ignoring of occasional interesting *variae lectiones*.

One other omission, however, seems to call for rectification. Mr Young does not even mention the quotations which Peacock—a man of very wide classical scholarship—prefixed to each canto of *Ahrimanes* by way of motto. He gives indeed Peacock's following translation of the four lines of Sophocles which head the first canto, but no indication of their source: and the quotation, as I shall presently show, has a double interest, since it explains an allusion in Peacock's *Memoirs of Shelley*, and at the same time narrows the scope for the date of *Ahrimanes*. The lines of Sophocles, which I find in *O.C.* 1225, run as follows:

ΜΗ ΦΥΝΑΙ *τον ἁπαντα νικᾳ λογον·*
το δ' επει φανῃ
βηναι κειθεν ὁθεν περ ἡκει,
πολυ δευτερον, ὡς ταχιστα.

Now in Peacock's account of Shelley's separation from his first wife, he describes very vividly the distracted state in which he found the poet, upon visiting him in London:

> Between his old feelings towards Harriet, *from whom he was not then separated*, and his new passion for Mary, he showed in his looks, in his gestures, in his speech, the state of a mind 'suffering, like a little kingdom, the nature of an insurrection.' His eyes were bloodshot, his hair and dress disordered. He caught up a bottle of laudanum, and said: 'I never part from this.' He added: 'I am always repeating to myself your lines from Sophocles:
>
> Man's happiest lot is not to be:
> And when we tread life's thorny steep,
> Most blest are they, who earliest free
> Descend to death's eternal sleep.'

This interview may be placed with most probability towards the end of June, 1814—Shelley left England with Mary Godwin on July 28—and it suggests a reasonable and probable date for Peacock's poem. Mr Young has shown that *Ahrimanes* was the outcome of Peacock's intercourse with Newton, whom he met first during a visit to Shelley at Bracknell in 1813. Shelley, certainly before the end of July in the following year, quotes with appreciation the rendering of Sophocles which Peacock prefixed, along with the original, to the poem which owed its subject to Newton. It is therefore at least a very probable conclusion that Peacock had written, and shown to Shelley, the first canto of *Ahrimanes*, either in 1813, or early in the following year. And

the probability gains some small amount of support from the familiarity with the subject of the poem which is implied in a passage of one of Shelley's letters to Peacock, written from Chamouni on July 24, 1816:

> Do you, who assert the supremacy of Ahriman, imagine him throned among these desolating snows, among these palaces of death and frost, so sculptured in this their terrible magnificence by the adamantine hand of necessity, and that he casts around him, as the first essays of his final usurpation, avalanches, torrents, rocks, and thunders, and above all these deadly glaciers, at once the proof and symbols of his reign?

The second canto of the poem was also introduced by quotations: two from Homer, both of which are struck out, and two others:

> Αλλαλαις λαλεοντι τεον γαμον αἱ κυπαρισσοι. ΘΕΟΚΡΙΤΟΣ.

and

> Tempestates, venteique sequuntur,
> Altitonans Volturnus, et Auster flumine pollens. LUCRETIUS.

These passages I find in Theocritus, XXVII 57, and Lucretius, V 745; and the rejected ones in the *Iliad*, V 89—92, and XXII 126—8.

Finally, in considering the theme of *Ahrimanes*, it is not without interest that Peacock wrote in a fair hand at the beginning of the poem, just above the verses of Sophocles, the sentence 'The devil is come upon the earth with great power'—a statement which recalls his effective repetition, in the mouth of the Manichaean Millenarian of *Nightmare Abbey*, of *Rev.*, xii 12, 'Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you (*Peacock*: among you), having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.' Nor is this the only connection between poem and novel. Newton's zodiacal system, at first deemed worthy of poetic treatment, soon sank in Peacock's mind to the level of an amusing fad; and it seems tolerably certain that the ichthyologist, Mr Asterias, of *Nightmare Abbey*, father of Aquarius and enthusiastic fisher of mermaids, owes his being, and his views on aqueous origins and Hindoo theology, to the fountain of which *Ahrimanes* was an earlier and less troubled spring.

H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH.

OXFORD.

REVIEWS.

Chaucer and his England. By G. G. Coulton. London: Methuen & Co., 1908. xii + 321 pp.

Mr Coulton's book on Chaucer and his time is much less entertaining than his former volume *From St Francis to Dante*, but it is happily free from the controversial spirit with which that book is pervaded. It is pleasantly enough written, and displays a competent knowledge of the state of society in the fourteenth century, though it can hardly be said to throw much new light upon Chaucer. The chief fault of the book is one of construction: the two parts of which it is composed are almost independent of one another. Chaucer's life and works are dealt with in the former half, and the conditions of English society in the fourteenth century in the latter; but the bearing of the last chapters lies in their application, and this is not supplied by the author. The chapters on Marriage, The Gay Science, The Great War, The Poor, Merry England, The King's Peace, Priests and People, and so on, form a series of essays which may be interesting in themselves, but in which Chaucer practically plays no part, except such as is suggested by the question (or is it an exclamation?) in the chapter on The Poor, 'How many such cottages did Chaucer, like ourselves, pass on his ride to Canterbury?' The life of Chaucer is told in a readable manner, and the latest authorities are utilised. It is a pity, however, that the author should adopt the eight-year love-affair as a biographical fact, and still more that he should repeat the suggestion that the poet was restrained by the influence of his wife, while she lived, from indulging his taste for indelicate stories. We have had too many of these quite baseless and highly improbable conjectures. Equally unlikely is it that Chaucer passed at any time through 'an intense religious crisis,' and that his occasional approaches to mockery indicate a reaction from this. Again, there is no probability in the conjecture that Ralph Strode was the author of *Pearl*, though two eminent scholars have disputed with one another for the credit of suggesting it.

Mr Coulton 'has not hesitated, in a book intended for the general public, to modernize Chaucer's spelling'; but this is a thing about which he ought to have had some hesitation, seeing that it has the effect of destroying to a great extent the character of the verse. It is true that he preserves the final 'e' when it is required for the metre in

the body of the verse, but he sacrifices it ruthlessly at the end, and Chaucer's verse reduced almost to a monotony of masculine terminations has a very different run from that which the author intended, and differs very widely from that of his Italian models. The passage of fourteen lines quoted on p. 45 had originally eleven double endings, of which all but two are lost in Mr Coulton's text, and in addition one rhyme is altogether destroyed by the alteration of 'wighte' to 'weight.' Moreover the metrical structure of the passage is obscured by the fact that two distinct stanzas are here given without any visible separation between them, a method which is also followed elsewhere, e.g., on p. 102.

Where Mr Coulton does best is in his endeavour to make Chaucer's daily life real to us by such careful details as those which he gives in reference to Aldgate tower, where Chaucer resided for several years, and the London Custom-house, where he worked; and in his explanation of the course of politics as bearing on Chaucer's fortunes. The account of the 'inspection and description' of the future Queen Philippa, when a child, quoted from the official register of Bishop Stapledon of Exeter, is a document of considerable interest; and we must thank Mr Coulton also for the illustrations, especially the beautiful pictures from the Louterell Psalter, and the amusing scene of the 'hostelry at night' on p. 139. The painfully modern photographs of Westminster Abbey and Westminster Hall might with advantage have been omitted.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Chaucer. A Bibliographical Manual. By Eleanor Prescott Hammond. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908. 8vo. x + 579 pp.

This book is another evidence of the fruitful interest taken in Chaucer studies on the other side of the Atlantic, and Chaucer students on this side will welcome it as an indispensable aid. A marvellous amount of care and labour must have been spent upon it by its author, and yet the result is by no means of the dry-as-dust order. The immense collection of facts and references is illuminated throughout by criticism, which is at once sober and interesting, so that in spite of the fact that the book is called a bibliographical manual, it proves to be thoroughly readable. We may fairly say that no such conspectus of the materials for Chaucer study has ever been presented before, and Miss Hammond is to be congratulated both on her choice of subject and on the manner in which she has executed her work. The chief fault to be found with it is that there is a certain disproportion in her treatment of the various branches of the subject. For the most part she reports progress, setting before us the actual results attained and the process by which they have been reached, with brief but apt comment and criticism. Sometimes, however, where it appears to the author that a subject has not been satisfactorily worked out, or where

it has especially engaged her own attention, she launches forth into an original contribution of considerable length, which may be full of interest, but would have been more in place elsewhere. Thus the arrangement of the *Canterbury Tales* is discussed in great detail, and an elaborate theory is proposed with regard to it, for which the author alone is responsible, and which involves a number of highly speculative assumptions, while *Troilus* and the *Legend of Good Women* are treated of with comparative brevity. The same criticism applies, more or less, to the discussion on metric, but here the author is on firmer ground, and her conclusions are less disputable. However, we must not be ungrateful. Miss Hammond has merely given us more than she promised: the bibliographical details are never neglected, an extraordinary store of references is accumulated for the assistance of the student, and the author usually displays a very sound critical judgment, guided by the determination to accept no results as established unless satisfactory proof is forthcoming.

The work consists of seven sections: (i) The Life of Chaucer, with most convenient reprints of the earliest biographies by Leland, Bale, Pits and Speght, and critical references to the succeeding accounts, followed by a survey of the modern investigations down to the Chaucer Society *Life Records*. (ii) The Works of Chaucer, dealing generally with the Chaucer canon, the chronology of the accepted works, and the sources, and concluding with a full bibliographical catalogue of the editions of the collected works. (iii) *The Canterbury Tales*, dealing first generally with the arrangement of the tales, then with the manuscripts, which are for the most part fully described, and then with the editions. After this follows an original dissertation of considerable length on the dates of the separate tales and the relation of each one to the general scheme, and finally the bibliography of each tale is dealt with separately. (iv) Works other than the *Canterbury Tales*, dealt with in alphabetical order. (v) Spurious or doubtful works. (vi) Linguistics and versification, with interesting contributions by the author, especially on the subject of the verse. (vii) A descriptive account, with a view principally to American students, of the principal libraries in which Chaucer MSS. are found, a review of the work of some Chaucer students, from Shirley to Furnivall, a list of the publications of the Chaucer Society, and a general reference list of the writers, books and journals most frequently referred to.

It will readily be seen how exceedingly useful such a work, executed with accuracy and sound judgment, must be to students. A few points of detail suggest themselves for criticism.

P. 94. On the Lollius question Miss Hammond seems to accept what is really much the least acceptable of all the theories proposed, namely that Chaucer did not know the name of the author of *Filostrato*. It is surely far more probable that the use of the name in *Troilus* is a mere mystification, not for the purpose primarily of concealing literary obligation, but in order to avoid the indecency of citing a contemporary modern author as sole authority for the truth of a supposed classical

story. Reference to some authority was evidently desirable, and it was impossible on such a matter to adduce merely the name of Boccaccio, without suggesting the fictitious character of the whole story. Chaucer has no difficulty in citing the authority of Dante for the tale of Ugolino, or of Petrarch for the Clerk's Tale; but when he needs an authority for the story of Troilus he has to invent one, and he uses Lollius to cover contributions both from Boccaccio and from Petrarch. This is very simple and very intelligible, and does not imply any mean motive or any impossible kind of ignorance. The only difficulty is as to the relation between the reference to Lollius in *Troilus* and the mention of him in *The Hous of Fame.*

P. 251. With regard to the argument founded on the two translations of 'pernicibus alis,' the author has overlooked the fact that in *Troilus* Chaucer is following not Virgil but Boccaccio, who has 'prestissime ale,' which Chaucer translates 'preste winges.'

P. 374. In the discussion of 'Daunt in English,' while rightly disabling Lydgate's critical power, Miss Hammond has neglected to observe that he seems to be quoting some expression used by Chaucer himself. 'Daunt in English, himself doth so expresse,' may mean 'Dante in English, as he himself calls it.' It is true that no such appellation of any of Chaucer's works is recorded in the MSS., but Lydgate may have found it somewhere as a half-humorous description of the *Hous of Fame* on the strength of its invocations. However, the application of the description to this poem must be regarded as very doubtful.

P. 486. It is a pity that one of the few quite intolerably bad lines in Chaucer, 'But thou wys, thou wost, thou mayst, thou art al,' should be selected as a normal specimen of his metre, especially considering the lightness and beauty of the Italian line which is set by its side, 'Tu savio, tu amico, tu sai tutto.'

P. 487. The line of Dante should of course be 'Lo giorno se n' andava, e l' aer bruno.'

P. 499. Is not Miss Hammond wrong about the scansion of the line of Milton? It is printed in the original editions, 'Created hugest that swim th' Ocean stream,' and though the indication of the apostrophe in these cases is not always trustworthy, yet here it suggests what is probably the correct reading of the line.

Finally we feel disposed to plead for a more careful use by English scholars of English words in their proper meaning. Chatterton's language cannot properly be said to be 'presumably archaic'; 'ostensibly' is surely the right word. We are told that Professor Lounsbury 'disavows' a certain statement, when the meaning is simply that he denies it; and that the *Clerk's Tale* must 'postdate 1373,' when the meaning is that it must have been written at a later date than this. Again 'geometrical progression' means something quite different from that which the author intends to convey by the phrase as used on p. 71, nor is 'rendition' the same as 'rendering,' though perhaps it may be justified by American usage.

But we do not wish to take leave of Miss Hammond in a tone of fault-finding. Her work on the whole is admirably conceived and excellently performed, and it cannot fail to further the interests of the study to which she has devoted herself.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

The Complete Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser. Cambridge Edition. By R. E. Neil Dodge. Boston, Mass., U.S.A.: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1908. 8vo. xxiii + 852 pp.

Readers of Spenser should welcome this excellent edition for its large type, exceptionally accurate text[1], catalogue of persons, places, etc., 'in or connected with' *The Faerie Queene,* and ample glossary with precise references. In these respects it is a substantial advance on previous editions. Particulars more open to question are: (1) the relegation of much glossarial matter to the notes, though the resulting inconvenience to the 'general reader' is partly compensated by the advantage of having a purer list of Spenser's archaisms; (2) the placing of the *Complaints* (publ. 1591) before *The Faerie Queene* (publ. 1590 and 1596). This is due to the prevalent view that the *Complaints* are largely a reworking of earlier material (see p. 57[1])—a consideration which applies with equal propriety to no small part of *The Faerie Queene.* Prof. Dodge thus departs from the historical order of the impressions produced by Spenser on the public. It may be maintained, even, that the *Complaints* would not have assumed their present form had Burghley received more favourably *The Faerie Queene.*

The *Biographical Sketch* and the critical discussions preceding each poem are, on the whole, careful, judicious, and well-informed[2]: satisfactory for the purposes of a popular edition. It is to be regretted that the editor chose to withhold the names of scholars supporting the views which he has occasion to discuss. The absence of these creates an air of vagueness. But this is not, what is much to be desired, an edition of Spenser addressed primarily to scholars, digesting the evidence and argument of research. Within Prof. Dodge's space limits, discussion of controverted points, illustration of sources, and record of more than the most important readings, were inadmissible. Nor is there any bibliography. These omissions are vexatious to the serious student, and render it difficult to recognize the editor's contribution to critical opinion.

[1] The careful collation and recollation of first editions is so stressed by Prof. Dodge, that one is surprised at his statement in the *Preface* that copies of the original editions of *Daphnaïda* and the *Prothalamion* are not accessible in the United States. Copies of both may be consulted at the Boston Public Library.

[2] An exception appears where Prof. Dodge states (p. xix) that in 1589: 'He [Spenser] and the old fame of his *Shepherd's Calendar* were "quite forgot".' This does not accord with Puttenham's familiar allusion and praise in 1589 (ed. Arber's Reprints, p. 77), or Webbe's in 1586 (ed. Arber, p. 35).

One important point on which I differ from Prof. Dodge is the date of Spenser's departure from England either shortly before or sometime after the publication of the *Complaints* (1591)[1]. It has been customary, and Prof. Dodge adheres to the custom, to understand by the 'Printer's' prefatory allusion to Spenser's 'departure over sea,' his departure subsequent to receiving his grant of a pension in February, 1591. The objections are: (1) we have no other evidence that Spenser had departed; (2) the departure is not distinguished as his *late* departure by contrast with his departure in 1580; (3) the context becomes implausible if a recent departure is assumed. The 'Printer' declares that the poems composing the *Complaints* 'were disperst abroad in sundrie hands; and not easie to bee come by, by [the poet] himselfe; some of them having been diverslie imbeziled and purloyned from him, since his departure over sea.' Diverse imbezzlings, purloinings, communication between author and printer, the author's vain attempt and the printer's successful attempt at collection, imply a passage of time befitting an allusion to 1580, but inapplicable to a departure shortly before publication. Moreover, according to Prof. Dodge (p. 58[1]) the collection had been made, and 'the copy must have been at least approximately complete,' before Spenser can have left London, since it was entered in the Stationers' Register under December 29, 1590. The 'Printer,' therefore, alludes to Spenser's departure in 1580.

Prof. Dodge seeks to escape this conclusion by holding (I think rightly) that this address of *The Printer to the Gentle Reader* is a subterfuge inspired by the poet himself. If so, whether Spenser's motive was diffidence (as suggested by Prof. Dodge, p. 58[1]) or a desire to shield himself from counter-attack[2], his disingenuousness would make him wish to seem plausible. He would, therefore, allude to his departure of 1580, and not to his departure which, on this hypothesis, was yet to take place.

We have, therefore, no evidence that Spenser left London until after the publication of the *Complaints*. Indeed, having avoided responsibility, he might wish to enjoy his triumph. Again, his grant of Kilcolman was not secured till October 26, 1591, and business connected with this is not unlikely to have kept him in London. Finally, he dates the dedicatory letter prefixed to *Daphnaïda*, at London, January 1, 1591 (modern style 1592). Prof. Dodge, in common with previous editors

[1] See *Spenser's Dating of Colin Clout*. N.Y. *Nation*, Nov., 1906. Prof. Dodge alludes to this (p. 678[2]).

[2] The unlikelihood that Spenser did not keep, or could not procure, copies of these poems, dedicated to his relatives or most intimate patrons, satirizing his chief enemy (Burghley), circulating at most in a limited group of court folk—and yet that a printer could obtain them—is very great. It is heightened by the representation of the 'Printer' that Spenser, though present in London, had no hand in the publication. The inference, that this is a subterfuge, is made probable by the circumstance that the *Complaints* are largely complaints against Burghley. Personal malice could not be urged against or visited upon the 'Printer,' while these indiscretions of the author would appear to have been 'purloined' (not circulated at his wish), and no longer 'easie to bee come by.' In this contingency, Spenser would wish them to appear to be juvenile indiscretions, and would therefore refer to his departure in 1580.

and biographers, explains this as a mistake or exceptional following of continental usage, claiming that Spenser meant 1591, modern style. The assumption is made to avoid two seeming difficulties: one created by the dating of *Colin Clout* (see note 1, above), the other by the date of Daphne's death (August, 1590). This, too, is easily met, for the dedicatory letter need not date from the first completion of the poem[1]. An assumption that the poem circulated for a time in manuscript or was written toward the end of 1591, involves less difficulty than to suppose it ready for publication on January 1, 1591: for in that case it should have formed a very appropriate part of the *Complaints*.

PERCY W. LONG.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U.S.A.

Die Inszenierung des deutschen Dramas an der Wende des sechzehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhunderts. Von C. H. KAULFUSS-DIESCH. (*Probefahrten*, VII.) Leipzig: Voigtländer, 1905. 8vo. viii + 236 pp.

Many problems of interest to the student of the drama have arisen in connection with the appearance of English players in Germany in the sixteenth century; none are, however, of greater interest just at present than that connected with the stage itself, especially as during the last few years the contemporary English stage has been the subject of numerous monographs[2]. The present volume offers a thorough investigation on this question—the *mise en scène* of the English Comedians. The author has, moreover, undertaken his task with an extensive knowledge of the German stage prior to the arrival of the English players: indeed, his introductory paragraphs on the stage of the medieval drama, the shrove-tide, school, and master-singer plays may be pronounced without hesitation the best concise treatment of the subject. And regarding the stage-setting of the plays of the English Comedians and of Herzog Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig, he has brought forward much new and valuable material and has also admirably arranged the old, especially in those paragraphs that deal with the actors and the acting. With the actual staging of the plays, however, he has not been, as I believe, so successful.

That the English Comedians brought with them what was to all intents and purposes the Shakespearean stage is the current opinion. But many matters of detail relating to this are still, and perhaps always will be, the subject of controversy. According to our best present

[1] Spenser's explanation in this letter of 'the occasion why I wrote the same [poem]' appears to connote a lapse of time.

[2] Cf. William Archer in the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 208, p. 442, where a discussion and criticism of six recent publications on the Elizabethan stage (1904–1907), and the announcement of a seventh, which has since appeared in part, is to be found.

knowledge the 'public' playhouses of Elizabethan London were fairly complex affairs. Is it probable that these wandering actors whom Fynes Moryson, after seeing them perform at Frankfurt a.M., called 'our cast despised Stage players[1],' should take with them any great number of stage properties? Indeed the case of poor Richard Jones who was obliged to beg the money to get 'a sute of clothes and a cloke' out of pawn is well known. Would they not rather make use of the stage of the English players when touring the provinces? But of this or even of the stage of the 'private' London theatres we know practically nothing. That these were more primitive and decidedly simpler is about all that we can affirm. Toward this view we have, indeed, for Germany some evidence, and again it is Fynes Moryson who, in the same paragraph from which the above was quoted, speaks of these English actors 'at Franckford in the tyme of the Mart, hauing nether a Complete number of Actours, nor any good Apparell, *nor any ornament of the Stage.*'

This whole question is not touched upon by Diesch, for whom the Elizabethan stage is the stage of the 'public' theatres. His authorities are the publications of Gaedertz, Brandl and especially the dissertation of Cecil Brodmeier: *Die Shakespeare-Bühne nach den alten Bühnenanweisungen*, Weimar, 1904. He accepts apparently the so-called alternation theory, although for this I am not able to point to any definite statement. In one important respect, however, Diesch differs from Brodmeier. He does not find, in the extant plays of the English Comedians, the least evidence of a curtain, temporarily shutting off a part of the stage, and from this argues that the Elizabethan stage also possessed none. The presence of a curtain, or better of curtains, is, however, now a recognized fact. In view of the material at hand it would almost appear that Diesch feared to admit the possibility of what is, after all, a very considerable difference in the two stages. I would rather believe that, as the 'corridor' or 'alcove' (i.e., the comparatively small space enclosed entirely or in part by curtains) was at best very dark and by no means necessary for all plays, the English players in Germany omitted it entirely as an unnecessary detail. Their audience was quite content to watch, for example, the preparations required for a banquet; indeed from the number of times which this particular scene appears in the few texts we have, it evidently appealed to the popular taste.

With Brodmeier Diesch divides his stage into three parts—a front stage without decoration, representing an indefinite locality, such as a street; a somewhat smaller rear stage with properties, representing a definite place, such as a room; and an upper stage or balcony. Regarding the front and rear stages he admits, however (p. 64): 'die beiden Bühnenfelder sind durchaus nicht streng geschieden. Sie können ineinander übergehen und so zur Neutralbühne werden.' Entire acts

[1] The reference from Moryson is quoted by Charles Harris: *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.* Vol. XXII, p. 446.

or even series of acts (in the *Fortunatus* of the 1620 Collection[1] the first three) he assigns to this neutral stage.

The occasional use of an upper stage or balcony by the English Comedians has long been recognized. Mettenleiter's description of Spencer's stage in Regensburg (Diesch, p. 59) certainly provides for such an upper stage; stage directions of *Titus Andronicus* in the 1620 Collection, which agree surprisingly with Shakespeare's, references and stage directions in the plays of Heinrich Julius and Jakob Ayrer prescribe it. Whether, as Diesch surmises, the balcony was also used for the fairly frequent 'Geistererscheinungen' and for the orchestra, which played a very important part in these pieces, is, to say the least, doubtful. The evidence for the division into front and rear stage must, however, be examined. What has been called 'the only obvious test of a rear stage scene,' the use of a curtain, is not to be found. Mettenleiter's description (Diesch, p. 59) of the Regensburg stage, on which he (p. 77) would not lay much weight, is too indefinite to base conclusions upon. We are left to the texts themselves.

'Der beste Beweis für die Trennung von Hinterbühne und Vorderbühne' Diesch (p. 63) finds in the third act of *Esther* in the 1620 Collection (Tittmann, p. 33 ff.): '*Haman kömpt mit dem Knapkäse Zimmermann.*' He orders Knapkäse: 'bawe mir einen Galgen in meinem Hofe, 50. Elen hoch.' Knapkäse takes the measure of the gallows from Haman himself, who finally becomes angry: '*Ziehet sein Gewehr. Er* (i.e., Knapkäse) *läufft. Gehen hinein.*'

The king now enters with a servant who reads to him in the *Chronica* of Mardocheus' action in saving the king's life. He asks what has been done to honour this man, the servant replies, nothing.

König. Nichts? das ist uns leyd: Sag wer ist dar im Hofe?
Diener. Grossmächtigster König, es ist Haman, der lest sich ein Galgen bawen.
König. Lass ihn bald zu uns herein kommen. *Holet ihn.*

Diesch (p. 63) comments: 'Währenddem (i.e., while the servant is reading to the king on the rear stage), so müssen wir annehmen, ist Haman mit Hans Knapkäse wieder auf die Vorderbühne erschienen, wo Hans den bestellten Galgen aufstellt. Der König fragt: "Wer ist dar im Hofe?" Diener: "Grosser König, es ist Haman, der lässt sich einen Galgen bauen." Es geht zwar aus dieser Stelle nicht mit absoluter Sicherheit hervor, dass die Erbauung des Galgens vor den Augen des Publicums geschieht; indessen gehen wir wohl in unserer Annahme nicht fehl, da ja der Galgen im nächsten Akte tatsächlich

[1] *Engelische Comedien und Tragedien*, etc., appearing 1620 in a first, 1624 in a second edition. The plays are for the most part accessible in the collections of Tittmann: *Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten*, Vol. XIII of Goedeke und Tittmann: *Deutsche Dichter des* 16. *Jahrhunderts*, and Creizenach: *Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten*, Vol. 23 of Kürschner: *Deutsche Nationalliteratur*. In the following quotations I give page references to Tittmann or Creizenach, the text itself, however, according to the copy of the 1620 Collection in the British Museum. An exact reprint of this, as also of the 1630 Collection, *Liebeskampff*, is much to be desired. Tittmann, especially, gives a greatly modernized text.

benutzt wird....Ist unsere Annahme richtig, so ist sie der beste Beweis für die Trennung von Hinterbühne und Vorderbühne.'

But is not this entirely begging the question? Diesch places the scenes arbitrarily on the front and rear stage, doing violence to the text, which clearly states that Haman and Knapkäse exeunt (*Gehen hinein*) before the entrance of the king with his servant, and then claims this as *best proof* for the division into front and rear stage scenes.

In support of his preconceived theory Diesch often leaves in the reader's mind an entirely false impression. A good example in question is the following, taken from the fourth act of *Titus Andronicus* in the 1620 Collection. Diesch (p. 73) writes: 'Im vierten Akte wird Titus veranlasst, sich die Hand abzuhauen, um das Leben seiner Söhne zu retten (auf der Vorderbühne); Helicates und Sophonus, die beiden Söhne der Kaiserin, führen auf der Hinterbühne die geschändete und verstümmelte Andronica herein, wo sie ihr Bruder[1] Victoriades findet und in seinen Schutz nimmt, und auf der Vorderbühne erscheint wieder Titus Andronicus; hier werden ihm die abgeschlagenen Häupter seiner beiden Söhne gebracht, und Victoriades führt ihm die unglückliche Andronica zu.'

From reading this description one receives the impression that for some of the action at least both the front and rear divisions of the stage are in use at the same time, which is not at all in accord with the actual, very definite, directions of the text. For after Andronicus has cut off his hand, the stage direction reads (Creizenach, p. 31 ff.): '*Gehen zusammen hinein.*' The stage is empty. '*Jetzt kömpt herauss Helicates und Saphonus*' with the mutilated Andronica. The two brothers '*Gehen weg. Andronica bleibet alleine....Nicht lange darnach kömpt...Victoriades.*' She would run from him and hide—'*leuffet sie ins Holtz.*' But Victoriades '*leufft hinein, holet sie wiederumb herauss.*' He expresses his pity and bids her: 'O kom mit mir, du solt hie nicht bleiben. *Gehet hinein.*' Evidently both go out and the stage is again empty. '*Nun kömpt herauss Titus Andronicus, Vespasianus, alsbald kömpt der Morian, bringet die beiden Häupter und die Handt.*' Morian exits, Titus calls down the vengeance of the gods upon his adversaries. '*Jetzt kömpt Victoriades, bringet die Andronica.*'

One sees how carefully the German adaptor avoids just what Diesch desires to find—the simultaneous use of two parts of the stage, representing different localities. In fact one only needs to read the texts themselves to become convinced that the compiler of the 1620 Collection, at least, never thought of any distinct division into front and rear stage. Very instructive in this respect is a series of short scenes in the third act of *Esther* (Tittmann, p. 29 ff.), where, however, even Diesch must admit (p. 62): 'Der Verfasser war anscheinend der Situation nicht mehr gewachsen und kehrte deshalb zu dem einfachen Prinzip der Neutralbühne zurück.'

[1] The text of the 1620 Collection is here corrupt—it reads *Vate*. Creizenach conjectures *Vetter*; a simpler conjecture would appear to me *Pate*; *Bruder* is quite impossible.

We cannot follow Diesch's argument in full—he analyses with more or less detail seven plays of the 1620 Collection—these examples must suffice. Is, however, the case of Heinrich Julius different, whom Diesch (p. 107) calls 'der einzige deutsche Dramendichter, der die englische Bühne bewusst und in vollem Umfange übernahm'? Eugen Kilian, who reviewed Diesch's publication[1], evidently thinks so. He writes (*Studien*, p. 144): 'Weit eher als bei den englischen Komödianten könnte man sich bei den Stücken des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig...mit der von Diesch vertretenen Annahme einer grundsätzlichen Teilung des Bühnenfeldes befreunden.' As 'kräftigste Stütze' he regards a passage in the tragedy *Von dem ungeratenen Sohn*. We find in the fifth scene of the third act of this piece a passage (Diesch, p. 87): 'welche für die Beschaffenheit der Bühne des Herzogs den untrüglichen Schlüssel abgibt. Die Szene spielt im Holze; Nero und seine beiden Mordgesellen Seditiosus und Hypocrita verschwören sich gegen das Leben des alten Herzogs. Hier sagt nun die Bühnenanweisung: "Die beiden gehen ab. Nero gehet aus dem Holtze, und kompt wider auff die Brücken." Aus dieser Stelle geht die prinzipielle Teilung des Bühnenfeldes in Vorderbühne und Hinterbühne deutlich hervor.'

There is, however, one difficulty with this explanation. This play offers, as Diesch readily admits, almost insurmountable difficulties in the staging. He gives then an arrangement which seems to him to have 'die grösste Wahrscheinlichkeit für sich.' In this he places woods and garden, both being necessary, side by side at the very back of the rear stage. He admits this to be merely a possible solution, but thereupon promptly uses this hypothesis to prove his point: the woods are perhaps to be located at the rear of the stage, Nero comes from the woods 'auf die Brücke,' he must then come from the rear to the front, consequently the stage is to be divided into two parts, a front and a rear stage. It is the same method of proof which was used in the case of the plays of the English Comedians themselves. That the actors played both on the front and rear of the stage goes without saying, but that there was any definite division into front and rear stage, either in the plays of the English Comedians or of Heinrich Julius has still to be shown; Diesch has not introduced any evidence that is in the least convincing.

Also in many points of detail I would differ from Diesch. To mention a few: on p. 79 he claims: 'Die Vorderbühne war im englischen Theater von der Hinterbühne dadurch scharf unterschieden, dass die letztere durch ein Dach geschützt war, welches der Vorderbühne fehlte.' This is, however, in itself very doubtful and only to be granted if we accept the theory that the curtains shut off everything behind the pillars. This same arrangement Diesch then reads into the very vague descriptions of the stages at Regensburg and Cassel, and conjectures a similar arrangement for all the larger stages of the English Comedians

[1] *Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte*, VII, 138 ff.

in Germany. In other cases—private houses, castles, etc.—he would have the rear stage surrounded with curtains. The only evidence he can produce for this (*Der bestrafte Brudermord*, which he introduces, is inadmissible because of the late date of the text) is to be found in the play *Von dem verlornen Sohn* (Tittmann, p. 66 f.). The Prodigal enters in beggar's clothing, he bewails his misery, for three days he has not eaten. 'Hie wil ich vor diese Thür gehn und bitten. Ach mein guter frommer Herr ich bitt, erbarmet euch uber mich unnd theilet mir mit ein Allmosen....*Es antwortet ihm einer unter den Tapetichten.*' Three times he approaches a door and each time he is refused, although there is no further mention of tapestries.

It would not seem possible on such meagre evidence to assert that the rear stage was surrounded by tapestries; I am inclined to believe that the 'Tapetichte' were the curtains hung before the entrances, of which we find evidence in Jakob Ayrer and the earlier Terence stage.

Nor is the case of the galleries with which Diesch surrounds the rear stage on three sides, with entrances directly upon the front stage—a slight modification of Brodmeier's arrangement for the Elizabethan stage—different. These he finds again in the description of the Regensburg stage (p. 59), where, however, there is absolutely no word of anything of the kind, and in the petition of Green, Danzig, 1615, where the word *Gallerey* refers only to arrangements for seating the audience. He claims (p. 83): 'Die Seiteneingänge sind ausdrücklich vorgeschrieben im *Konigssohn von England*' (Tittmann, p. 218), where the stage direction in question reads: (the king) '*Gehet hinein, kömpt auff der andern Seiten wieder.*' I can picture the scene perfectly well, including the following entrance of the magician, with three back entrances or even two. Side entrances are not necessary, and certainly not prescribed.

In fact, the back entrances seem to have occasioned Diesch unnecessary trouble. In the plays in question he finds but one absolutely necessary, but '*aus Gründen der Symmetrie*' (p. 82) he provides his stage with two. Surely, however, at least two entrances are called for by the 1608 Graz text of *Niemand und Jemand*[1], where we read (Bischoff, p. 177): '*Hie khombt aus ein Thor Cornuel, zum andern Thor begegent ihm Morganus,*' or '*Hie khomen Martianus und Malgo zu unterschidlichen Thorn aus.*' I imagine, however, that the actual number of entrances depended to a very great extent upon other conditions and that no precise number can be given.

It is just in this respect that Diesch lays himself open to severest criticism. He starts with a preconceived, and in many details false, notion of the Elizabethan stage. On to this stage he forces the plays of the English Comedians, although in support of his theory he is often obliged to resort to conjecture and to an unwarranted interpretation of the text. To local conditions, which undoubtedly played a most

[1] Edited by Bischoff: *Mitteilungen des historischen Vereins für Steiermark*, 1899.

important part in the stage arrangements of these wandering actors, he allows little or no room[1].

M. Blakemore Evans.

Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A.

Goethe und die Seinen. Quellenmässige Darstellungen über Goethes Haus. Von Ludwig Geiger. Leipzig: R. Voigtländer. 1908. 8vo. 374 pp.

In the preface to this book the author explains what he wishes to be understood under the somewhat ambiguous term 'die Seinen': 'Es ist die Welt, die ihn nach Begründung seines Heines umgab, es sind die Bewohner seines Hauses, die Mitglieder des kleinen vertrauten Kreises, der täglich, ja stündlich um ihn war,' or, in other words, Goethe's 'Familie der freien Wahl.' A good deal has already been written on this subject, and monographs exist on most of the members of Goethe's household, but Professor Geiger claims for his book that it is the first in which the 42 volumes of letters, the 13 volumes of diary and the 10 volumes of conversations have been so freely used, and given such a prominent place in the foreground.

The work falls into several sections. The first of these is devoted to 'Die Gattin,' whose history is traced from the day she first met Goethe in the park at Weimar in 1788, till her death in 1816. This is by no means the first attempt to vindicate Christiane's character from the aspersions cast upon it by the indignant 'Weimarerinnen'; but by the juxtaposition of the various poems, letters and reports having reference to Goethe's life-companion, we get a clear and illuminating view of the 'dicke Ehehälfte,' as Charlotte von Schiller was wont to call her. Professor Geiger, in passing a final judgment, does not commit himself further than to describe their union as one 'dass unsere Teilnahme fordert und unsere Achtung,' but he closes the section with the words of Frau von Knebel, who, in a very impartial description of Christiane's character, declares 'dass Goethe nach seiner Eigentümlichkeit nie eine passendere Frau für sich hätte finden können.'

Section II is devoted to August, Ottilie and 'die Enkel.' A full account of August von Goethe's melancholy existence has not yet been written, and the 67 pages devoted to Goethe's son in this part of the book will be welcome to all who wish to become better acquainted with Goethe's family circle. The details of his early life and his official career, though in themselves of no intrinsic interest, shew how harmful

[1] It should be added that there are a rather large number of simple printer's errors in Diesch's publication, also a few of a somewhat more serious nature. Of this second class I note the following: p. 77, first line of the paragraph, for 'Spencers Nürnberger Bühne' read 'Spencers Regensburger Bühne'; p. 81, four lines from top, for 'V. B.' (Vorderbühne) read 'H. B.' (Hinterbühne). Most troublesome, however, is the error, p. 58, in the first line of the quotation from Duncker; for 'Au devant du Paris' read 'Au devant du Palais.' The reference to *Deutsche Rundschau* is here also wrongly given; for '48, S. 219 ff.' read '48, S. 260 ff.'

to his character and development generally was the unsystematic and disconnected method which his father followed with regard to his education and upbringing. And yet the fact that his life was not an even greater failure is probably due to the almost fanatical love of order which he certainly inherited from his father, and which the elder Goethe constantly encouraged and demanded, even to the detriment of other and more valuable faculties. As regards his character and his personal relations to his father, Professor Geiger's view differs somewhat both from that of Karl von Holtei, who represents his friend as gifted but without character, and from that held by another of August's contemporaries, whose account of Goethe's son is one of the few trustworthy documents on this subject that we possess. According to Jenny von Pappenheim, August Goethe was a man of good abilities and amiable disposition, whose one misfortune was to be the son of his father: 'die Nähe des Vaters floh er, weil die forschenden Blicke, die unausgesprochenen Anklagen ihn einschüchterten. So kam es, dass er, der sonst so Fröhliche, sich in den Räumen Goethe's am liebsten stumm und missmuthig in die Ecken drückte,' etc. (Lily Braun, *Im Schatten der Titanen*, p. 123 f.). Dr Geiger, on the other hand, lays considerable weight on the evidence we possess to shew that August was kept closely in touch with his father's intellectual life, that he became indispensable to his father's activity, and that even their collaboration on purely business and official matters bore a more intimate and personal character than has generally been assumed. It must be confessed, however, that in the documents he adduces, the impression one gains is not that of intense filial or parental affection, but rather of dry business transactions between two men in their official capacity. There can be no doubt as to Goethe's affection for his son, however disappointed he may have been in his subsequent development; but even Professor Geiger is forced to admit in the end that 'Der Fluch seines Lebens war...das niederdrückende Gefühl: Goethes Sohn zu sein.'

In his treatment of Ottilie, Dr Geiger errs perhaps on the side of being too severe. He comments on the fact that, after August's death, the intimacy between father- and daughter-in-law, at first so great, seemed to diminish; and he attributes this to Ottilie's 'grobe Vernachlässigung der Pflichten einer Hausfrau.' He laments that she should have understood so little how to brighten the declining years of the aged poet and should have forced on him the burden of duties which properly fell in her own province. But here again we have a more sympathetic picture from the hand of her friend Jenny von Pappenheim. From this we learn that Ottilie, after August's death, daily devoted six hours of her time to her father-in-law; to quote her own words, as reported and later corroborated by her friend: 'oft kann ich nicht mehr und glaube ohnmächtig zu werden vor Schwäche, doch der Gedanke dass ich ihm nützlich, ihm nothwendig bin, dass ich seine alten Tage verschönern und in der Welt zu etwas gut sein kann, dieser Gedanke giebt mir die Kräfte wieder. Neulich haben wir den Plutarch zu lesen angefangen, und schliesslich las er mir aus dem zweiten Teil des Faust;

es war schön und gross, als ich aber nach 11 Uhr mein Zimmer betrat, fiel ich meiner Länge nach zu Boden' (*Im Schatten der Titanen*, p. 119). Of course it is impossible to deny that Ottilie was frivolous even to excess; but when, speaking of her life, Dr Geiger says: 'Es ist nicht das Leben einer Mutter, die sich der Pflichten gegen ihre Kinder bewusst ist, und noch weniger das einer Frau, die den gefeiertsten Namen Deutschlands trägt; man ist manchmal versucht, an eine Abenteurerin zu denken, die in der Welt herumzieht und jede ihrer Launen befriedigt,' and then produces some contemporary gossip to justify his hard words about her, we are inclined to think that he does gross injustice to Ottilie and that, overlooking the good points in her 'problematische Natur,' he unduly accentuates the less pleasing ones.

The account of the two sons and their somewhat misguided attitude towards their grandfather's inheritance is of great interest, and the description of the author's unsuccessful interview with these two jealous guardians of the family treasure is clearly characteristic of their behaviour towards even the most serious and conscientious of Goethe-students. We get a clear idea of the curious blight which seemed to lie over the lives of these two not ungifted men, whose melancholy existence is only illuminated by the generosity with which, at the close of their lives, they handed over the incomparable gift of all the family treasures and archives for the use of the German nation.

The Section devoted to 'Haus und Hausverwandte' is perhaps the part of the book which presents least interest to the general reader. Goethe's relations to his coachmen, his cooks, and other domestics are illustrated from notes of his Tagebücher and correspondence. His transactions with the actors and actresses at the Weimar theatre are discussed. Finally Goethe's friends, more particularly those of his later years, are presented to us. Schiller is intentionally left on one side; Meyer and Zelter are sympathetically characterized, and finally, as 'untergeordnete Hausgenossen,' Riemer and Eckermann. The Kanzler v. Müller, as usual with Goethe's biographers, comes off very badly: 'Kein Umgang, der eines Goethe würdig war.' Dr Geiger does not even do him the justice of quoting him absolutely correctly on p. 173, where a very slight inaccuracy causes the chancellor's words to produce a more unpleasing impression than they do as they stand in the original (cf. *Unterhaltungen mit dem Kanzler von Müller*, ed. Cotta, p. 183). It is, moreover, scarcely fair to insist on the unworthy manner in which he acted with regard to Goethe's 'Nachlass,' and to omit to mention at the same time the many difficulties of the work he undertook, as well as the thanklessness of his task, owing to the attitude taken up by the rightful heirs.

Jessie Crosland.

London.

La Rhythmique Musicale des Troubadours et des Trouvères. Par Pierre Aubry. Paris: A. Picard, 1907. 4to. 67 pp.

Die Melodien der Troubadours. Von J. B. Beck. Strassburg: Trübner, 1908. 4to. viii + 202 pp.

The object of the first of these books is to show the incorrectness of Hugo Riemann's system of interpreting the melodies of the trobadors and trouvères and to prove the author's own hypothesis that these melodies, though they are not written in mensural notation, belong to the *ars mensurabilis* of the Middle Ages.

According to Riemann, the rules for the measuring of music, which were laid down by the mediaeval theorists, applied only to music written in several parts, and the rhythm of the trobadors' melodies depended entirely on the structure of the verse, each syllable being sung to a note or group of notes of equal time-value. The task of transcribing the old melodies into modern notation becomes a very simple one if Riemann's method is employed, but there is no reason for believing that the musical rhythm of the songs was anything like what he supposes, for the known facts concerning the music of the Middle Ages give no indication of such a rhythm ever having been employed. Riemann's system of interpreting the melodies is indeed an invention of his own.

M. Aubry on the other hand arrives at his conclusion after studying the rules of the mediaeval theorists, examining MSS. which contain two-part music (which was undoubtedly measured) as well as melodies, all the music being written according to the same system of notation, and comparing MSS. which contain the same songs, written in mensural notation in one MS. and not in the other. The conclusion which he draws after a logical examination of all the facts is that the melodies should be measured according to the system of modal formulae, of which frequent mention is made by the old theorists. The musical modes resemble classical metres, the first three, the most often used, corresponding to the trochaic, iambic and dactylic. M. Aubry gives a number of examples of songs from MSS. not written in mensural notation, which he transcribes according to the modal interpretation, and the results are very satisfactory as regards the music itself and the rhythm and meaning of the words.

M. Aubry has always maintained that the melodies of the trobadors and trouvères should be interpreted mensurally, but in the present work, as he admits himself, he departs considerably from his former method of interpretation. He formerly believed that the Old French and Provençal chansonniers, such as Paris Bib. Nat. 844 fonds fr., 22543 fonds fr., Arsenal 5198, etc., were actually *written* in mensural notation. A further study of the MSS. and of the history of mensural notation has led him to discard this belief, and in the present volume he sets forth a method of interpretation for which it may be claimed that it is at once the most satisfying and the most reasonable that has

yet been suggested. M. Aubry has the gift of being able to write on a thoroughly technical subject in really good prose, and the clearness and ease of his style help his readers to follow his arguments without difficulty. That we are convinced by them is due to the solid facts on which he bases them.

It is strange that during all the time that has elapsed since the revival of interest in the poetry of the trobadors which started about a hundred years ago, scarcely any attention has been paid to the music of the songs. Words and music were inseparable in Provençal lyrics, the two halves which made up the whole of the song. The fact that the songs which survive in their complete form are very much less numerous than those the words only of which are in existence is surely no reason for not studying those melodies which do exist. The musical branch of the art of the trobadors was, nevertheless, almost entirely ignored until a few years ago. For some time past it has been studied by MM. P. Aubry, H. Riemann and A. Restori, but the first complete general survey of the subject is contained in the book by Dr J. B. Beck now before us. The value of Dr Beck's book to all students of trobador literature can scarcely be overestimated, and it should do much to give to the study of the music that prominence which has hitherto been denied it. A description of the contents of this volume will give some idea of the thoroughness and care with which Dr Beck has worked at his subject. The first part contains a list and description of all MSS. containing trobador melodies, a complete list, arranged in alphabetical order, of the existing songs with music, with an indication of the MS. or MSS. in which they may be found, notes on this list, and a description of the notation in which the melodies are written in the MSS. with many examples. This part concludes with a survey of the different views of modern students, especially MM. Aubry and Riemann, as to the proper method of interpreting the melodies of the trobadors. The second part consists in an exposition of the writer's theory as to the original rhythm of the songs and the correct way in which to transcribe the melodies, with many examples in the original and in modern notations. The work is not yet complete; Dr Beck announces that he hopes shortly to publish the entire collection of all known trobador melodies. When this collection appears, it and the present volume will form a most important contribution to the study of mediaeval Provençal literature.

The first part of the present volume needs no special discussion. Dr Beck's theory as to the proper method of interpreting the original notation of the MSS. and of measuring the rhythm of the songs is substantially the same as that put forward by M. Aubry in the book just noticed—namely that the actual notation employed gives no indication of the relative value of the musical notes, but that the melodies should be interpreted according to the modal formulae. It is clear that this part of Dr Beck's work was written before the appearance of M. Aubry's book, for he nowhere alludes to the latter, but makes frequent reference to the erroneous view formerly held by M. Aubry, that the trobador melodies were written in mensural notation. No

stronger argument in favour of the modal system of interpretation could be found than the fact that two such zealous and careful investigators as M. Aubry and Dr Beck should, independently of each other and treating the subject from slightly different points of view, have arrived at the same conclusion. Dr Beck lays stress on the importance of the discovery of the modal rhythm in Provençal and Old French songs as a help to the study of Romance metre. The interdependence of metre and musical rhythm on each other is a very interesting question. Dr Beck, while recognising the purely syllabic system of measurement employed in Romance verse, is inclined to attach undue importance to the tonic accent of Romance words. He describes the Second Mode, ⏑ –, as 'der echt romanische Rhythmus' because, though the musical accent generally falls on an atonic syllable, the tonic syllable is compensated by having a note of double the time-value of the accented note—a levelling-out of values thus taking place which he considers eminently suitable to the non-accentuated character of Romance verse. It is not very probable that the trobadors were actuated by consideration of the tonic syllable in words when choosing the 'modes' in which to make their songs. Dr Beck's study of the melodic rhythm of the songs is nevertheless of great interest and value. The modal method of interpreting the music will probably become universally recognised and adopted. Now that Dr Beck has lessened the difficulty of transcribing the melodies, it is greatly to be hoped that all future editions of trobador and trouvère poetry will contain melodies as well as words when the former exist. The songs lose much of their character when the words only are considered and the aesthetic value of the melodies is quite great enough to make them worth consideration. The student of music and the student of Romance literature should alike be grateful to Dr Beck, for his work opens a new aspect on both subjects.

Barbara Smythe.

London.

Grammaire historique de la langue française. Par Kr. Nyrop. Tome III. Paris: Picard, 1908. 8vo. viii + 459 pp.

Since the appearance of Darmesteter's epoch-making work, *De la création actuelle de mots nouveaux dans la langue française*, in 1877 the study of the subject has so widened that the learned author of the present volume has found it necessary to omit his promised study of semantics altogether, and to reserve for it a volume which we hope will soon be published. It is with great regret that we learn that he is suffering from an affection of the eyes which renders all reading impossible; we sincerely hope, however, that he may be able to complete his volumes on semantics and syntax, both of which are so much to be desired. The present work of Nyrop deals with the methods of formation generally and with those that Darmesteter left untouched, viz., regressive formation, irregular formation and onomatopœia.

Though no writer of the last thirty years has proved so productive of new words as Balzac, yet Zola, Bourget and Anatole France all add a considerable number to the vocabulary. The *historique* of the neologism is clearly stated, and we find quoted a protest by the late *académicien* Brunetière against innovations. This sturdy classic claims that such should be regularly debarred unless they correspond to *réalités*: yet we must admit the claim of a modern symbolist poet to place his impress on the language, as well as that of Hugo to 'mettre un bonnet rouge sur le vieux dictionnaire.' Nyrop expresses sanely the attitude we should adopt towards neologisms: 'Selon nous, les néologismes sont les résultats nécessaires et les marques infaillibles de la vitalité forte et saine de la langue, ou, pour parler plus correctement, ils témoignent d'une imagination poétique et plastique toujours en éveil, d'efforts continuels pour rendre l'expression plus variée, plus nuancée, plus pittoresque. Il ne faut pas tenter d'endiguer le flot des néologismes: il saura bien se régulariser lui-même; les mots mort-nés ne tarderont pas à disparaître sous la surface de l'eau, les viables entreront vite dans le grand courant de la langue parlée, qui, grâce à ce. surcroît constant, se rajeunira, s'embellira et sera de plus en plus apte à exprimer les nuances infinies de la pensée humaine.' The chapter on onomatopœia strikes us as extremely interesting and original. Nyrop points out that the names of sounds are entirely conventional and often differ widely from one country to another, thus the noise made by the duck is represented in English by 'quack quack,' and in Denmark by 'rap rap.' No direct observation is brought into play: thus a clock always says 'tic-tac' or 'tick-tock,' and if we try to hear 'tac-tic,' after a second or so we shall again hear 'tic-tac,' so strongly does the force of habit dominate the impression of our ears. Onomatopœia always offer a series of vocalic modulations thus: i—a, i—o or i—a—ou with fixed harmonics; the reason, though Nyrop does not note it, seems to be that the first of a series is always a front vowel with a high musical pitch with rapid return of the tongue to the position of rest or, from the point of view of pitch, a high and then a low pitch or, in the case of a series, from the vowel having the highest to that which has the lowest musical pitch. An interesting chapter of the book is that which deals with the neologisms of politics and literature. Many of those formed can remain only as interesting examples, such as 'beaupérisme,' 'henriquinquiste,' invented to describe the action of President Grévy's son-in-law Wilson in the sale of decorations and the supporters of the claims of the late Comte de Chambord (called Henri V) to the throne of France, while others, 'extrême-oriental,' 'moyenâgeux,' may be said to have received 'droit de cité' if not recognition by the Académie.

The study of suffixes, both Latin and French, gives proof of years of earnest work, and offers the most complete study of the subject extant; the difference between those suffixes the activity of which has ceased and those which are still living is stated with the greatest clearness, e.g., -ia at the time of Charles the Simple no longer served to form a compound 'Normándia' and therefore recourse had to be had to ía

whence 'Normandía' > 'Normandie,' but one cannot help thinking that another explanation is possible, viz. that the new word 'Normandie' might stand in the same relation to 'Norman(d)' as 'baronie' to 'baron.' Vast numbers of compounds have disappeared from the language, thus out of the numerous examples derived with the help of the suffix -ison < itionem, only 'garnison,' 'guérison' and 'trahison' remain. So vast was the vocabulary of Old French that we feel some sympathy with Gautier, who revelled in words as every examiner knows, when he protests that the Malherbian reform, while it cleared away many tares, yet destroyed many a golden ear. Chapter V. dealing with 'Mots composés' does not do more than study types and the enquirer should turn to Darmesteter's exhaustive work the *Traité des mots composés* (2nd edition, 1894). The only addition we note here is 'un cinq heures' (§ 720).

In some interesting additions the use of initials, generally in professional or student slang only, to avoid a long or clumsy phrase, we find the remark that those in the Services des Postes, Télégraphes et Téléphones are known as the P.T.T., it will be of interest to note whether their recent strike will generalize this convenient abbreviation.

It must be a matter of great joy to the learned professor to find so many devoted friends and pupils ready to undertake the routine work of correcting and indexing. So devotedly has this been done that we are unable to find an important reference omitted or a false one given. Praise from us is needless, but we may say that this work increases the debt of gratitude that students of French owe to the learned professor of Copenhagen.

A. T. Baker.

Sheffield.

Étude Scientifique sur l'Argot et le Parler populaire. L'argot français et étranger dans ses vocabulaires, ses origines, ses éléments et son interprétation. Par Raoul de la Grasserie. Paris: H. Daragon, 1907. 8vo. 179 pp.

The plan adopted in this work has been, first to classify all forms of parlance from the highest to the lowest; and then to characterise and illustrate by copious examples the processes which have given rise to all below the level of standard speech. 'L'espace,' the author aptly says, 'se divise entre les parlers, mais en couches horizontales pour les diverses classes, tandis qu'il se divisait en tranches verticales entre les langues différentes.' So the various parlances take rank in an order descending with the power of abstract expression possessed by each, and consequently corresponding roughly to a descent in the social scale. Parlance not being however exclusively the outcome of social conditions, the above correspondence is merely approximate, and 'higher' and 'lower' almost of necessity remain vague terms. 'Ces étages,' says the author in reference to them, 'correspondent aux diverses classes sociales, ainsi qu'à la culture intellectuelle.'

Both classifications, that of speech and of its modes of formation, are carried out by the aid of a carefully devised nomenclature. In it 'glose' means any parlance or form of speech; 'orthoglose,' one springing from normal conditions; 'paraglose,' one acquired to suit new ones. So cant or 'la langue verte' is an 'orthoglose'; trade terms make up a 'paraglose,' the 'technoglose,' in fact; whilst trade and professional slang are classed under the heading 'ergoglose,' an instance of the clearness of the distinctions made. But the inclusion of dialects here is a little surprising, the difference between parlance and language having once been illustrated by speaking of the one as horizontal and the other as vertical. Of course the convenience of the author's arrangement in other ways is sufficiently obvious. The difficulty comes in trying to lose sight of the difference between dialect and social parlance on finding the two thus classed together.

It is a pity that good two pages of an interesting introduction should have been spent in defining such words as 'intellectuel,' 'matériel'; and in drawing a careful distinction between 'parler' and 'langage,' which is disregarded in what follows. This will probably not, as the author seems to hope, tend to popularise a piece of work which is essentially of a learned kind; and it merely leads to pitfalls, in one of which his own foot is unhappily taken. 'Ce qui est invisible et inaudible est, au contraire, immatériel,' he says incautiously. But the following two passages of real importance are also open to criticism. 'Ce serait un acte de volonté expresse, or de tels actes sont inconnus du langage,' is one; 'autrefois, il n'y avait point dans une langue ces différents étages; tout le monde employait le parler devenu inférieur depuis,' is the other. The existence of the French language is of itself sufficient to shew the second statement to be incorrect of classical times, nor is it any more applicable to the Middle Ages either.

The book suffers from one regrettable defect. It contains far too many misprints, and some other mistakes which have obviously escaped correction. It is perhaps needless to quote examples. Of the four chapters on foreign slang, the one on English slang is largely taken from the Introduction to Hutton's *Slang Dictionary*, edition 1864. But there are errors here, e.g., 'shree sheats in the wind' for 'three sheets in the wind'; 'smelling chete' is incorrectly glossed 'grange'; 'walking a mortes' should be 'walking mortes'; 'chanut' should be 'chaunt'; 'boit of blood,' 'bit of blood.' It is, too, hardly fair, without qualification, to charge the author of the *Slang Dictionary* with confounding Slang and Cant, when he has carefully defined both. 'Although in the Introduction,' he says, 'I have divided Cant from Slang, and treated the subject separately, yet in the Dictionary I have only, in a few instances, pointed out which are Slang, or which are Cant terms. The task would have been a difficult one. Many words which were once Cant are Slang now.' But M. de la Grasserie transcribes Harman's 1566 list from the same work, without stating that the words it contains are sixteenth century slang—an important omission with respect to a form of speech so perishable as a non-literary parlance. In this connec-

tion it may be interesting to observe by the way, that 's'en torcher le nez' (p. 78) was good English seventeenth century slang: 'and the King own a marriage...and so wipe their noses of the Crown' (Pepys, *Diary*, July 17, 1667). The references to folk-lore and proverbs in Ch. iv. are interesting, and a short chapter is devoted to proper names. But it will be for the two able classifications referred to above and for the wealth of examples it gives, that the book will be chiefly valued.

G. A. Parry.

London.

Jean Racine. Par Jules Lemaitre. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1908. 8vo. 328 pp.

Some apology is due for the tardy notice in these pages of such an important book as M. Lemaitre's *Jean Racine* which last year charmed all Paris. The excuse we would tender is one that the author will surely accept and even commend, since it implies the triumph of his art. M. Lemaitre's pages compel you to turn again to the *Théâtre* of Racine, and on that enchanted ground the voice of criticism is hushed. Something of the same witchery is exercised by M. Lemaitre's own work. Its beauty and its skill dazzle the reader and conceal the defects of its argumentation. No one of Racine's tragedies can compare in interest, as the critic truly says, with the story of his life. And in handling this theme M. Lemaitre employs with consummate mastery all the qualities which it demands—learning, sympathy, style, and a sense of the dramatic.

The result is a book as full of life and interest as any play or novel. The tragedy is held together and its action is controlled by the dominating figure of Port-Royal, which broods over the whole like the Nemesis of Æschylus or Sophocles. The note is struck in the first pages, where we are shewn the four Solitaries passing in silence through the streets of La Festé-Milon, the home of Racine's parents and his birthplace; and it sounds all through the story till his death and burial beside M. Hamon, the best-loved teacher of his childhood. M. Lemaitre sees that this influence of Port-Royal, begun before Racine was born and always surrounding him, however fiercely for a time he fought against it, gives unity to that agitated life with its worldly successes and its moral failures, its glory and its baseness. He does not, we venture to think, appreciate Jansenism at its proper theological value nor see how directly it derives from St Paul; but he thoroughly understands its psychology, and his picture of the Jansenist in his cell and before the world is a masterpiece and throws into high relief the figure of the wayward youth who owed so much to Port-Royal and profited so little by the lessons of unworldliness which he learnt there. The influence of the place upon his art (which is quite another matter) was considerable, and is of course duly noted. 'L'opinion de Port-Royal sur la nature humaine se retrouvera dans ses tragédies; elle le fera véridique et hardi dans ses peintures de l'homme. Et, à cause de Port-Royal, jamais (sauf dans l'Alexandre)

il ne donnera dans l'optimisme romanesque des deux Corneille and de Quinault.'

Enough has been said in order to illustrate the skilful construction of M. Lemaitre's study. But among many instances of his extraordinary literary skill, one in particular deserves to be cited, and that is the way in which the reader's mind is prepared for the appearance of Alexander the Great on the Racinian stage. The irresistible appeal of this romantic figure has never been better described, and no one can fail now to understand why in 1665, the year of the execrable War of Devolution and five years after the Spanish marriage, Racine the courtier produced, and Louis the King applauded, the play in which the interest centres on this 'héros amoureux et guerrier.'

It is a thousand pities that M. Lemaitre's enthusiasm for Racine has led him to be less than fair to his great rival, and indeed to anyone that ventured to question, not his genius, but his supremacy. Out of a score of references to Pierre Corneille there are perhaps two which can be twisted into a faint confession of merit; while with regard to Madame de Sévigné, the critic permits himself to use an epithet which can only be termed 'fâcheux' (it is his own word for Racine's action in the matter of his *Alexandre*). He calls that great-hearted lady 'la grosse Sévigné.' Such impertinence tempers with disgust our delight in M. Lemaitre's prose.

There are certain passages which render the book unsuited to—let us say, les demoiselles de St Cyr—for instance the extremely ingenious and probably sound defence of Racine's youthful morality. But after all it was not written for young people, and we trust that it may have many English readers and help to the better understanding of a poet who is little understood by us. To discuss at length the causes of this want of appreciation lies outside our present purpose. The general ground is no doubt that which Mr Tilley has indicated in his recent volume *From Montaigne to Molière*, viz., Racine's lack of imaginative expression. The Elizabethans have created in us an appetite for this which finds satisfaction in the French romantic writers whom M. Lemaitre evidently despises rather than in the delicate and subtle art of Racine. And here it is worth while to point out a strange oversight on the part of this champion of classicism. He makes merry, as many have done before him, over the 'couleur locale' of the Romantics and against it places the 'couleur historique' of Racine, shewing quite truly that Racine manages to give the right setting to his exotic personages without the help of technical terms. But the same might be said with equal truth of the chief of the Romantics. A comparison of *La légende des siècles* with, say, the painful archaeology of Leconte de Lisle shews that Hugo was past master in the very art so greatly praised by M. Lemaitre in Racine, viz., the power of creating an atmosphere and conveying the general truth of a distant period or climate without regard to accuracy of detail.

H. F. Stewart.

Cambridge.

Guy de Maupassant. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Von Paul Mahn. Berlin: Egon Fleischel und Co., 1909. 8vo. xvi + 556 pp.

Dies umfängliche, mit Fleiss und Liebe geschriebene Werk ist ohne Zweifel zur Zeit das einzige, aus dem eine wirkliche Kenntnis von Leben und Werken des letzten grossen gallischen Erzählers geschöpft werden kann; vor allem die Analyse der Dichtungen lässt die kurzen, gelegentlichen Andeutungen weit hinter sich, die man in französischen Büchern über Maupassant findet. Dennoch muss ich gestehen, dass das Ergebnis zu der Arbeitsleistung nicht im rechten Verhältnis steht. Die Biographie bringt nur in kritischer Abwehr literarischer Legenden einen allerdings sehr dankenswerten Fortschritt. Die Persönlichkeiten, mit denen der grosse Schriftsteller in einem belebten Dasein in Verbindung kam, werden zu sehr als bekannt vorausgesetzt, die Eltern und die schriftstellernde Geliebte (Frau Lecomte de Nouy) etwa ausgenommen. Und doch wäre sein Verhältnis zu Edmond de Goncourt z. B. so gut wie das zu Louis Bouilhet einer Besprechung würdig gewesen, die ganz gewiss zu einer Entlastung des von Mahn mit Recht (S. 467, 482, 525) scharf getadelten 'gentilhomme de lettres' nicht geführt hätte. Der Verfasser geht aber überhaupt auf die literarischen Zusammenhänge viel zu wenig ein, und wo er es tut, wie (S. 96) bei der Charakteristik des 'fabliau,' geschieht es in nicht einwandfreier Weise. Ebenso wird die Zweiteilung in 'Darsteller' und 'Erzähler' (S. 375), an sich treffend und fruchtbar, zu ausschliesslich vom Standpunkt Maupassants aus angenommen.

Und wie die literarhistorische, bleibt die literarische Seite des Buches hinter unseren Erwartungen zurück. Die Übersetzungen, durchweg misslungen, werden durch die Unmöglichkeit, einen Meister des einfachen Ausdrucks adäquat zu übersetzen, entschuldigt. Aber es tut weh, in einem Werk über diesen Virtuosen Ausdrücke zu treffen wie 'wurstige Skeptik' (S. 340), 'tränen' im Sinne von 'weinen' (S. 214), oder das zweimalige 'ungeheuer skeptisch' in sich deckenden Stellen (S. 321, 337). Und nicht einmal, wo sich in ihm ein berechtigter Zorn regt, findet er das rechte Wort: viel zu schwach ist (S. 467) der Ausdruck 'Gemeinheit' für die bodenlose Niedertracht, von der Goncourts schnüffelndes Behagen erzählt.

Ist das Buch aus diesen Gründen nicht geworden, wozu der hingebende Eifer des Verfassers es wohl gern gemacht hätte, so bleiben doch Verdienste genug, um derentwillen wir Mahns Werk über seine französischen Vorgänger stellen konnten.

Schon in der Gliederung und Einleitung der Novellen ist zur tieferen Erkenntnis seiner literarischen Eigenart wenigstens ein guter Schritt vorwärts getan, wenn auch die Analysen oft zu äusserlich bleiben. Wichtiger noch sind die Beobachtungen über Kunst und Technik, die über Maupassants Stil (S. 408), seine Kunst der Schlüsse (S. 418), seine Sensibilität (S. 398) und seinen Esprit (S. 413) feine Bemerkungen bringen und ein vortrefflich gewähltes Belegen die Kunst

dieses neuen Boccaccio illustrieren. Endlich aber sind auch Mahns Worte über die Persönlichkeit Maupassants von Bedeutung: sein Verhältnis zu den Frauen, zur Schriftstellerei (S. 518), zur Musik (S. 395), zur Politik, zur eleganten Welt sind noch nirgends so klar und fest ausgezeichnet worden. Nur einen Denker möchte ich ihn nicht mit Mahn (S. 159, 169) nennen und auch von seiner Philosophie (S. 313–448 f.) ungern sprechen. Er war ein wunderbarer literarischer Apparat, der kaum seines Gleichen hatte; begabt mit unerhörter Kraft, seltsame Vorgänge so loszulösen, dass sie bei aller Verständlichkeit ihre Seltsamkeit behalten wie pathologische Präparate; aber dies war ihm eben nur möglich, weil er nicht philosophierte, d. h., keine Gegensätze aufzuheben suchte, vielmehr die Unverständlichkeit der sozialen und psychologischen Zusammenhänge einfach als ein 'Urphänomen' anerkannte. Ein Ansatz zum Ethiker war vorhanden in diesem vom Verfasser richtig gewürdigten sozialen Mitleid, dass die Anklage für so viel nur verschuldetes Elend mit Schopenhauer'schem Grimm in das *Dossier de Dieu* (S. 441) schrieb; aber zu einer Klärung auch nur der eigenen Ansichten hat es der unaufhörlich beobachtende Dichter nicht gebracht, nicht bringen wollen. Die seltsame, echt französische Naivetät des Raffinements stört er durch keine Verallgemeinerung und das Raffinement der Naivetät durch keine ethischen Prinzipien. Impressionist im moralischen Sinn, Klassizist im ästhetischen ist er unter den vielen Mischungen und Gärungsprodukten unserer Zeit eins der merkürdigsten, der gelungensten.

Echt deutsch zerbricht Mahn sich darüber den Kopf, ob Maupassant schon Genie oder nur Talent heissen dürfe (S. 426 f.). Ich meine auch: er stand an der Grenze. In der Meisterschaft der Form hat er, altheimische Übung erneuernd und steigernd, ein erstaunliches Talent erwiesen; in der Kunst, sich an den wunderbaren Verwicklungen des Weltlaufs immer wieder erregen zu lassen, zeigt er eine heute ganz einzige Genialität.

Richard M. Meyer.

Berlin.

The French Influence in English Literature from the Accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration. By A. H. Upham. New York: Columbia University Press, 1908. 8vo. ix + 560 pp.

This essay—the author insists that the work must not be regarded as final—will, in spite of its deficiencies, be welcomed by all students of literature in England and France, and help to fill a serious gap. After an Introduction rather overladen with facts for twenty-four pages, a second chapter in which we distinguish the guiding hand of Professor J. B. Fletcher, deals with the Areopagus Group. Though the idea of a parallel between the group of Sidney and the Pléiade is not new, the numerous points of contact are clearly made out by the author, and

not too closely pressed, as is becoming. In the third chapter on the Elizabethan Sonnet we observe a distinct tendency to underrate the dominating factor that the sonneteering outburst led by Watson and Sidney was directly prompted by the poets of the Pléiade, and not by the Italian Petrarchists. Moreover, the results of recent research are occasionally overlooked, as in the case of the sonnets of Daniel and Drummond of Hawthornden, which owe as much to France, or very nearly, as to Italy. Next a chapter of some seventy-five pages is devoted to the translators and imitators of Du Bartas. Here the author is evidently on congenial ground, and in these few pages, packed with information, supplies interesting parallels and traces probable lines of connection which are as yet far from being common knowledge. It may be noted that Milton is put aside rather too unceremoniously, and that certain of the longer poems of Drummond have not been taken into account. Despite these few deficiencies, the chapter in question is about the best in the book, and affords ample evidence of independent research. Chapter v, on Rabelais, supplies less promising material, but is none the less very readable and well-informed. In Chapter vi Montaigne's relation to Bacon, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Raleigh, Drummond, Burton and Browne is investigated. On the important question of Montaigne in England Mr Upham appears to have carefully studied the works of J. M. Robertson (1897), Jakob Feis (1891), F. Dieckow (1903), and Miss Elizabeth Robbins Hooker (1902), but, strangely enough, he does not seem to have read the remarkable studies of his country-woman, Miss Grace Norton. He is distinctly behind the times in regarding Montaigne as a pure sceptic, and instead of a rather dry accumulation of facts from which the reader is left to draw his own conclusions, we would have preferred to have been shown in what way and to what extent the authors mentioned were influenced by Montaigne. In connection with Bacon, for example, the *Novum Organum* is passed over in silence; we are not told if Bacon's invention of the experimental method owed anything to Montaigne. We trust that M. Villey will clear up this and other points in his promised parallel between Montaigne and Bacon. The sources of Montaigne's *Essays* and of those who copied them should also have been taken into consideration in estimating certain specific borrowings. The results obtained by Villey were not then available, but those of J. de Zangroniz and others were in print. Thus some of the passages from Drummond's *Cypress Grove* quoted in Appendix B as imitated from Montaigne's *Essays* turn out on closer investigation to have been transmuted in part from Charron's *Sagesse*. A consideration of Seventeenth Century Précieuses and Platonists occupies the seventh chapter—not a very obvious division of the subject. Satisfactory headway is made in Chapter viii (Romance, Drama, and Heroic Poem), and in Chapter ix (Minor Literary Forms), till we reach the final chapter which is occupied with the author's Conclusion. A useful Bibliography and two Appendices complete the volume. The general impression left is that much valuable material has been collected, but that the extent and particularly the nature of the influence exercised by French litera-

ture in the period chosen has not been sufficiently emphasised; the objective method has been carried out too rigorously.

L. E. Kastner.

Manchester.

Le Lyrisme et la Préciosité cultistes en Espagne. Par Lucien Paul Thomas. (Beiheft zur *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie.*) Halle: Niemeyer, 1909. 8vo. 191 pp.

This monograph is a study of the evolution and progress in Spain of cultism, the post-renaissance parasite known in other countries as marinism, euphuism, or preciosity. Traces of it have been detected in earlier periods, under the influence of Provençal and Petrarchian poetry, and scholastic writings. But humanistic stylists and rhetoricians were the medium *par excellence* in which fine writing was degraded into the pedantry and chronic bad taste of the cultists. In the Peninsula the 'new style,' as it was at first called, was consciously affected about the year 1609 by Carrillo, Gongora, and Paravicino; Herrera of the previous century had prepared the way. The fact that gongorism became synonymous with cultism may show that Gongora was the precise originator—still a mute question—or simply that he was considered the arch-sinner in conscious preciosity; it may only emphasise, however, that he was the greatest poet of the new school and the one who had made the most conspicuous *volte-face*, in the interest of notoriety. All this, and the literary war which ensued, in which Lope, Tirso, Alarcón, Quevedo and other writers were arrayed against Gongora, Jaureguí, Villamediana and their numerous followers, and the subsequent triumph of the bad cause, M. Thomas studies in a most masterly way. He has an enviable command of his facts, the fruit of long investigation, and displays an independence of judgment that is at times somewhat disconcerting. But the nature of his subject precludes definitiveness in details, more especially in the sections dealing with the ill-explored 'selva selvaggia' of the early decades of the seventeenth century. The relation, for example, of Marino to Spanish cultism has not been satisfactorily determined. It may be noted that Lope, in his dedication of *Virtud, pobreza y muger* (1625), does not seem to consider 'la bárbara aspereza que llaman culta' the same as marinism. Then, too, M. Thomas has wholly overlooked the novel and the drama in his researches. They contain information that helps to antidate phenomena noted in his study. Tirso, it may be recalled, satirized cultism in *Amor y celos...*, probably acted in 1616. So did Lope in *El anzuelo de Fenisa*, licensed in the same year. Both plays use the word 'culto' in an unfavourable sense. Lope's comedia also refers to the purists as 'los palpables,' a designation that has escaped M. Thomas, as have also the following: 'la nueva seta' (*El castigo sin venganza*); 'estos poetas que escriben sin natural' (*Las flores de don Juan*, cited 1618); in *Los peligros de la ausencia*, Lope designates the new school as poets who write 'á lo moderno.' In *La*

dama boba (MS. dated April 28, 1613) Lope seems to recognise cultism as a legitimate ingredient of style:

Nise.

Hay dos prosas diferentes,
Poética e historial:
La historial, lisa y leal,
Muestra verdades patentes
Por frasi y terminos claros;
La poética es hermosa,
Varia, culta, licenciosa
Y oscura en ingenios raros:
Tiene mil exornaciones
Y retóricas figuras.

Celia.

Pues de cosas tan obscuras
¿Juzgan tantos?

Nise.

No le pones,
Celia, pequeña objeción;
Pero asi corre el engaño
Del mundo.

The passage is somewhat ambiguous, more especially as Nise is a bluestocking. The same play attacks conceptism.

One of the few plays mentioned by M. Thomas, Tirso's *La celosa de si misma* is ascribed to the year 1623. It is usually dated much earlier. M. Thomas promises a second part to his study. It is to be hoped that cultism in the novel and the drama will there receive treatment.

Milton A. Buchanan.

Toronto.

Dante Alighieri. La Vita Nova. Suivant le texte critique préparé pour la 'Società Dantesca Italiana' par Michele Barbi. Traduite avec une Introduction et des Notes par Henry Cochin. Paris: H. Champion, 1908. 8vo. lxxx + 246 pp.

Dante's Vita Nuova. With Rossetti's Version. Edited by H. Oelsner. (*The King's Classics.*) London: Chatto and Windus, 1908. 8vo. lix + 274 pp.

The *Vita Nuova* (or *Vita Nova* as M. Cochin prefers to call it, finding the Latin orthography more congenial to French readers) lends itself wonderfully to translation in the kindred Romance language. The French translator can achieve a closeness and literalness of rendering quite impossible to us Teutons, and that without undue violence to his literary medium. Of M. Cochin's rendering, clear and limpid and unlaboured yet with a delicate archaic flavour—borrowed in part from the vocabulary of the *Roman de la Rose*—this is conspicuously

true. He is to be congratulated (so far as a foreigner may presume to judge) on the grace and the faithfulness both of his prose and of his verse translations, which form a charming *vis-à-vis* to Signor Barbi's text. The prose especially is not only literal to a marvel, but manages constantly to preserve something of the cadence of the original. The introductory 'Reflections on the Vita Nova' have the characteristic illuminating quality of all good French work; and M. Cochin manages to deal freshly and strongly with a well-worn subject. Especially good is his estimate of Dante's relation to the *dolce stil nuovo* and of his real contribution to vernacular poetry.

The dainty series of 'The King's Classics' is enriched by an excellent edition of Rossetti's classic rendering of the *Vita Nuova*: a rendering to which M. Cochin himself pays the highest tribute, as to 'the best result obtained hitherto.' 'Mais l'anglais,' he adds, 'est, pour traduire, une langue merveilleuse.' Nothing like the literalness of a French translation is possible in English, for the genius of the language is so diverse. Nor can the identical cadence and melody be reproduced in our tongue, as M. Cochin manages to reproduce it with but sparing archaisms and inversions. Yet Rossetti's noble translation is faithful even in its aberrations, being the product of a mind uniquely gifted for the task. On Rossetti and his Dante-worship and the genesis of his translation and many kindred subjects Professor Oelsner's Introduction is most valuable; and useful also are the well-chosen notes and the four illustrative Appendices.

LONSDALE RAGG.

TICKENCOTE, RUTLANDSHIRE.

Tenuis en Media. Over de Stemverhouding bij Konsonanten in Moderne talen met een Aanhangsel over de fonetiese Verklaring der Wetten van Verner en Grimm. Door H. LOGEMAN. Gand: E. van Goethem. 1908. 8vo. ix + 206 pp.

Experimentelle Versuche über die labialen Verschlusslaute im Deutschen und Französischen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung methodischer Fragen. Kapitel I bis III. Von PAUL SEYDEL. Breslau: H. Fleischmann. 1908. 8vo. 69 pp.

The problem of the classification of stop-consonants is one which has engaged the attention of phoneticians for a long time, and still remains one of the most debatable in the whole field of phonetics. A convenient review of the history of this problem will be found in the recently published Breslau dissertation by Seydel. This is however still incomplete, the final chapter which is to bring the results of the author's experiments not having appeared at the moment of writing. It is therefore not yet time to judge how much furtherance we may expect from this new contribution to a delicate problem. It is worth noting, however, that in contrast to some recent investigators Seydel emphasises once more the value of the distinction between 'Spreng-

und Lösungslaute,' first set up by Sievers, as a criterion for classification.

The traditional division of these sounds was a dual one into the series Tenues and Mediae, which finds its expression in the employment of a double set of written signs to denote them. It was natural then for phoneticians to start from this dual division, and to try and give it a scientific significance. This was not easy, for although the double series of signs was employed in practically all languages which were written as well as spoken, very few languages agreed in the varieties of sound actually associated with them. The Tenues and Mediae, when a review of the languages was held, represented two allied series of sounds each showing many varieties in detail. So long therefore as the traditional dual division was upheld, the burning question was to find a characteristic difference between the two series which held good for all languages no matter how manifold the variation might be in detail. The dual division still exerts its influence on the minds of phoneticians although there is little agreement in regard to the criterion by which it is to be carried through, as may be seen from Seydel's historical review above mentioned. It is noticeable however (although this fact is not brought out clearly by Seydel) that in recent times a tendency has declared itself to abandon the traditional dual division. This is exemplified by Jespersen, whose position in regard to this question seems to me more independent than would appear from Seydel's notice (where he is grouped along with Brücke). Jespersen divides the stops into five, not two classes; and a characteristic feature is his expression of the opinion, that one of these classes is not to be regarded as belonging to either the Tenuis or the Media series. This step in the direction away from the dual division is not perhaps a very decisive one: Jespersen's opinion just cited is expressed quite guardedly, and the old duality evidently still looms large on his mental horizon. Furthermore his classification rests entirely on the laryngeal factors involved in the production of these sounds, to the neglect of the oral factors (mode of explosion etc.). But it is worth while perhaps to raise the question as to whether such a step be not necessary, whether the dual division be not a Will-o'-the-wisp. It does not follow necessarily in the first place, because most languages recognise a division of stops into two classes, that this division rests on a constant, objective difference between the two. In the second place, if we start from the assumed necessity of a dual division it always raises the question of a 'characteristic' or 'essential' difference, which has to be found ere it can be made the criterion of division. And then we must ask, Is it quite clear what is meant by a characteristic or essential difference? Have we as yet defined quite objectively what is characteristic or essential in this connection? My doubts are not removed, rather, greatly strengthened, by reading Mr Logeman's work, in which the search for the essential difference plays a great part. I am not going to deny that an objective essential difference may finally be found to exist between a Tenuis and a Media, but I question strongly whether it is such as Mr Logeman

conceives it to be. Mr Logeman seeks for the characteristic difference from the acoustical standpoint. To explain the difference, he looks for a genetical factor (or rather series of factors) whose variation produces an auditive effect recognised by the ear. As this standpoint is carried through by Mr Logeman, it is open to the objection that a confusion is made between two very different things: namely, sounds in the physical, and sounds in the linguistic sense. Mr Logeman comes to the conclusion that a Tenuis has always a different resonance cavity from the corresponding Media, and that this fact is the 'essential' difference between the two. But this difference in resonance cavity is only the condition of a difference in sound physically speaking; it does not necessarily follow that the linguistic ear ('Gehör') recognises it. A *p* pronounced with the lips protruded and one pronounced with the lips drawn in against the teeth are physically quite different sounds, but for the linguistic ear both are the same sound, and the same holds good in many other examples which will occur to every phonetician. What reason is there therefore to conclude that what is in such cases not an essential difference, should be one in the case of Tenuis and Media? Mr Logeman apparently feels dimly that he is here in conflict with his own conception of 'type-klanken' (type-sounds) according to which a speech-sound in the phonetical sense is an abstraction from a whole series of physically different sounds (which the linguistic ear accepts as one and the same sound). He attempts to get over this by drawing a fine distinction between 'theoretical' and 'practical' resonance differences. The latter exist for the ear, the former do not. But he makes no attempt to show why this difference in the case of Tenuis and Media is a 'practical' one. It is plain that before we decide what is essential to the ear for recognising difference in sounds, we must have a clear idea of the conditions under which the linguistic ear recognises similarity in physically different sounds. Do we not here reach a point at which the phonetician must call in the aid of the psychologist? It is significant that Mr Logeman's own confidence in the value of his essential difference seems to vary at different times. The final sections of his work weaken it to such an extent, that it seems to be in considerable danger of vanishing into thin air. I mention here at once a further defect in Mr Logeman's reasoning. While in general we must admit that there is a feeling for a characteristic difference (however hard to define) between Tenuis and Media in most languages, we must also recognise that this feeling is not so persistent as Mr Logeman makes out. It is sometimes lost, where it once must have existed. This occurs, as is well known, in various German dialects. The conditions under which this takes place are not yet clear, though one of them is doubtless absence of voice in the Media. But the fact itself may be accepted as a strong hint that the difference between Tenuis and Media is one of degree, that between the clearly recognisable extremes there are 'Zwischenstufen,' which do not seem to belong to either group. In practice, if not in theory, Mr Logeman perhaps recognises this (but cf. below): witness such phrases, which he frequently uses, as 'a Tenuis which makes the

impression of a Media' etc. I take the opportunity of suggesting that the factor of intensity may have some value in the explanation of such 'Zwischenstufen.' Compare the case cited by Jespersen[1] of the confusion of initial *p* and *b* in South German dialects. There is a strong tendency in German for on-sounding consonants to be lenes[2]. It seems to me that as the lenis level is approached the ear loses the faculty of distinguishing between Tenuis and Media if both are voiceless. This applies to the hearer: the speaker himself may still be able to distinguish on the basis of his muscular sensations when all distinction for the ear is lost. And also at the fortis level it is perhaps open to doubt whether the difference between Tenuis and Media can be perceived by the ear quite independently of *all* but auditive associations. It is by no means clear to me that the whisper test on which Mr Logeman lays much weight proves that the ear is so independent. Even in English where the 'Flüstergeräusch' plays the *rôle* of voice in the case of Media, I cannot be certain that the ear perceives inevitably the difference in a pair of words such as 'lacking' and 'lagging' when whispered. A little experiment which I have attempted with such pairs of words on a listener seems to bear this out strongly; but here again the matter seems to me to be only capable of final solution by the psychologist.

Mr Logeman's investigations are planned on an extensive scale—although perhaps not quite so extensive as the 'moderne Talen' in the title might lead one to expect, the languages actually examined being French and the Germanic tongues (English, German, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian). One cannot but admire the extent of Mr Logeman's practical linguistic attainments, but it seems doubtful whether his selection from the modern languages is not at once too wide and too narrow. Too wide because he can hardly do justice to all the languages treated inside the necessary limits—the very extensive material which the German dialects alone offer for the treatment of this question is scarcely touched upon: Mr Logeman, e.g., gives only a passing notice to the interesting stops of the German dialects, and his practical identification of the S. G. Mediae with the Danish[3] in no wise balances this. Too narrow, because after all the Germanic languages and French represent a rather arbitrary limitation of the whole field of modern languages. One has a feeling that Mr Logeman owes us a proof that the generalisations he erects on the basis of this material could have anything but a very limited applicability.

Mr Logeman's book further presents many difficulties to the reader on account of its defects of exposition. It contains an unusual number of repetitions, anticipations, and digressions. The author has his hobby horses which are constantly running away with him: such as the worthlessness of all attempts to grasp the nature of Tenuis and Media on the basis of the contrast between voice and voicelessness, the 'verkeerde isolatie' (an evil spirit which apparently dogs the steps of everybody

[1] *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, p. 110.
[2] Cf. Saran, *Deutsche Verslehre*, p. 68.
[3] See § 49.

but himself) etc. The development of his own views is inextricably mixed up with polemic excursions and definitions of technical terms. Under the circumstances the lack of a table of contents makes itself felt, in spite of a careful index.

The intention of the book seems to be a double one: first, the discovery of the essential difference between Tenuis and Media; secondly, an attempt to lay bare the conditions under which voice is present or absent in the production of stops and spirants. These then prove often to be further the conditions of a transition of sounds from one class to another, which as will appear must be considered a rather surprising result from Mr Logeman's standpoint. I have indicated shortly above the nature of the contrast which the author conceives between Tenuis and Media, as also my opinion that the conception is exceedingly vague. There is indeed more than reason to believe that it is quite a vague one even for the author himself—otherwise he could hardly employ such contradictory phrases as: 'En media die geheel de indruk maakt van een tenuis' (§ 57); this from an author who declares elsewhere that the ear is the only judge of a sound! What *is* a Media of this sort, if not a Tenuis? Why then call it a Media? One almost suspects that anything which is written *b*, *d*, *g* in the ordinary orthography is a 'Media' for the author, even although the spoken sound it represents be actually a Tenuis. But let us look at some of the consequences of Mr Logeman's Tenuis-Media theory.

The articulatory factors on which this contrast between the two depends are asserted to be purely oral—voice or its absence is therefore an accident, so far as the nature of the sounds is concerned, and as any oral articulation can *a priori* be combined with voice, it follows that a voiced Tenuis is just as possible as a voiced Media. Further, according to the author, these factors are concentrated in the moment of closure. The form of explosion has nothing to do with the contrast; it is an accident in the same sense as the voice, for both Tenuis and Media may be either 'gesprengt' or 'gelöst.' (*En passant*, it is interesting to note that when he disposes of the 'essentiality' of the distinction between 'Spreng-' and 'Lösungslaute,' the author, although he polemises against Bremer who is accused in a foot-note of a profound 'verwarring' in his ideas, does not even mention Sievers, to whom the whole conception is owing.) Under these circumstances nothing stands in the way of an extension of the Tenuis-Media idea to the spirants as well as the stops and this is accordingly carried out.

All this the author supposes to be borne out by the material which he has collected from the languages mentioned above. It may be as well to examine how far this supposition is correct. We have seen that in the author's eyes the essential difference between Tenuis and Media is one of resonance cavity. This being so, one would naturally expect that either could occur as a lenis or fortis, and that differences of breath pressure (intensity) would have nothing to do with the nature of the sounds. This the author recognises in § 184. Yet in § 35 we find the statement: 'Daar nu de adem bij de dan wijd openstaande stembanden

(in the case namely of voiceless initial Mediae) in groter volume komt aanstromen, is die ademstroom krachtiger en zal het kunnen gebeuren dat de lenis tot semi-fortis, zelfs fortis wordt, d. w. z. *de Media kan zo Tenuis worden'* (italics are mine). Why however the Media should change its resonance cavity and therewith its nature as Media in response to a change in a factor of which it is independent, i.e. breath pressure, the author nowhere explains. Again, the author insists till one becomes weary of his insistence, that the behaviour of the vocal chords has nothing to do with the nature of a Media or Tenuis, yet plainly in the passage just quoted the open position of the vocal chords is implicitly recognised as a condition for the change of Media to Tenuis, while further on in the case of the Danish Mediae (see § 54) it is expressly claimed as the cause of the shifting of these sounds in the direction of Tenues. Elsewhere (p. 130) the transition of Media to Tenuis is limited to the case in which 'de Media niet met zacht begin gesproken is, *waar de stembanden dus niet eerst gespannen waren'* (italics are mine). In any case it is plain that the author in practice, although in contradiction of his theory, regards the behaviour of the vocal chords as having a very important influence on the nature of the Mediae. To this there is also a pretty parallel in the case of the Tenues. The author furnishes us in § 159 with the following generalisation on the Tenues in the languages he has examined: 'De enkelvoudige middentenuis zal altijd met stem gehoord worden...Naar mate de middentenuis meer stem heeft, zal die ook eerder media worden.' If a voiced Tenuis is, as the author asserts (§ 169), for all purposes the same thing as a voiceless Tenuis, why should it then become a Media, 'naar mate dezelfde meer stem heeft'? Note, Mr Logeman does not say 'a Tenuis becomes a Media when it is voiced,' but, 'in proportion as it has more voice.' The distinction is a delightfully fine one, but there are plenty more distinctions in his book, which are equally fine, and equally delightful. Does the author really expect anyone to believe both these things together: (i) That the condition of the glottis, whether open or closed for the vibration of the chords, is immaterial to the nature of Tenues and Mediae; and (ii) that the transition of Media to Tenuis or *vice versâ* is a result of the condition of the glottis? Plainly we can only understand this transition in so far as it is a consequence of the variation of essential factors which go to make up the 'nature' of the sounds involved.

The confusion in this book as regards essential points hardly calls for more exemplification, and I am accordingly not greatly moved to state where I disagree with the author in matters of detail, but it will be necessary to say something about the result of Mr Logeman's investigations in regard to the conditions which bring about the voicing or unvoicing of stops and spirants, since on these depends largely the new conception of Verner's Law which is put forward in the Appendix. The author operates with two series of factors to explain the presence or absence of voice, firstly, the nature of the on-glide or off-glide; secondly, accent (stress and pitch). The employment of the

first may be exemplified from the following formula based on a review of the languages mentioned above: 'Elke begin-media met geleidelik begin is stemloos. Elke begin-media met zacht begin heeft stem' (§ 66, a similar formula for the Tenues § 117). That such a formula is no explanation is obvious; on the author's own principle that the 'organen anticiperen geregeld een volgende posietie,' there is hardly anything left open except to regard the nature of the on-glide as dependent on what follows, not *vice versâ*. The author of course, as indicated above, regards the on-glide as the determinative factor (§ 41). There is something more to be said for the influence of the off-glide as determinative (cp. the formulae for final Mediae and Tenues). But the glides can hardly claim much importance in this connection unless as intermediaries; they respond to the same influences as the consonants themselves, and the real determinative factors must accordingly be looked for elsewhere. We turn therefore with more interest to the *rôle* assigned by Mr Logeman to the factors of accent. Here we meet with one constantly recurring conception, namely the following: (*a*) Decrease in expiratory force and falling tone protect a voiced stop or spirant from being unvoiced, and favour the voicing of a voiceless one, i.e. when a voiced Media follows the stress and the chromatic accent it remains voiced; under similar circumstances a voiceless Tenuis or Media becomes voiced (¯| ag'a remains ¯| ag'a; ¯| ak°a > ¯| ak'a)[1]. (*b*) Increasing expiratory force and rising tone have the opposite effect. (*c*) When word stress and chromatic accent do not fall together and stress precedes, then the effect on a consonant standing between the two is the same as in the latter case (cp. § 82 a). The distinction between (*b*) and (*c*) is only apparent, for although Mr Logeman recognises that a rise in tone is not necessarily accompanied by an increase in pressure, in practice he assumes that it generally is, and hence exercises the effect here assigned to it. At bottom therefore the real determinative factor in (*a*) (*b*) (*c*) is the syllabic stress. The syllabic musical accent seems only to act through the stress which accompanies it, since Mr Logeman evidently assumes in practice that falling tone and decreasing pressure, rising tone and increase in pressure go together; cp. 'Komt...plotzeling een luchtstroom uit de longen, b. v. *door* dat de stem *de hogte inschiet*, als bij een vrag...' (italics mine). There is a hint here of a parlous confusion between the separate ideas of tone and stress. I now proceed to illustrate how Mr Logeman applies this theory. I must however first indicate his conception of the syllabic boundary, as it here plays a *rôle*. To put it shortly in the convenient terminology of Sievers, he recognises the existence of 'Schallsilben,' when word stress and chromatic accent fall together before the syllabic boundary; of 'Drucksilben,' when both or either come after the boundary: e.g. ¯| ata (Schallsilben), but | a ˇ ¯ ta or ¯ a ˇ | ta (Drucksilben). In the last case he in practice recognises a 'minimal pause' between the two

[1] In Mr Logeman's notation ¯ and _ mean high and low tone respectively; | before a syllable means that it is stressed. k°, k' are voiceless and voiced guttural Tenuis, and so on.

syllables. These syllabic conditions he regards as inherent in the nature of language and therefore as holding good for all languages and all times. That the existence of Schallsilben in German and English is dependent on quantitative factors he does not take into account. Nor does he trouble himself to enquire whether there is truth in the assertions of those who attribute to some languages a preference for Drucksilben.

In § 82 the author discusses three sentences in his own language, namely: (1) Nou ja, dat kun je nu natuurlik alle dagen zien gebeuren. (2) Uwe dagen zijn geteld. (3) Niet één dag, maar dagén lang.... In (1) and (2) the *g* of *dagen* is said to vary as follows: Speaking of No. 1, 'voor [alə] is er 'n miniem klein oponthoud waarin des noods adem gehaald kan worden, de stem gaat op de [a] sterk de hoogte in, [alə] wordt dus hoog en krachtig ingezet en valt geleidelik al minder en minder van expiratie wordende, tot de [ən] van [gebɸrən]. Bij de [a] van [dagən] is die dus hoger en krachtiger dan op de [ə]. Bij de [a] trillen de stembanden die ook voor de [ə] (hoewel minder) moeten trillen. Er is absoluut géén pause voor de [g], die de stembanden gelegenheid zou geven weer in de rustposietie (ongespannen, stemloos!) terug te vallen. Dus is de [g] van [dagən] in 't eerste geval een stemhebbende lenis, 'n stemhebbende media (Lenis and Media apparently once more identical; cp. above p. 558). Nu bespreek ik 't derde geval. Daar in die samenhang ligt de nadruk op de *en* van *dagén*, de [g] wordt bij de tweede silbe gevoeld, er komt een duidelike, al is 't ook nog zo korte stroomvermindering voor de [g] waardoor de stembanden in de rustposietie terug kunnen vallen en de [g] is (als begin media) stemloos. En...kan dus onder die nadruk semi-fortis, of fortis en zelfs tenuis worden.' Two things will be noticed here: (1) The behaviour of the vocal chords is made to depend directly on the expiration. (2) A decrease in expiratory force is made to accomplish two different things: (*a*) In sentence 1, a continuous decrease does not allow the vocal chords to assume the position of rest, whereas (*b*) a transitory decrease produces this effect in sentence 3. Hardly anyone, I think, will find with Mr Logeman that the phenomena of voicing and unvoicing are rendered any clearer by this form of explanation.

In the application of this theory Mr Logeman does not fail to fall into contradictory statements. It is obvious that, in the case of what is now known as Verner's Law in English[1], the conditions which led to the voicing of originally voiceless sounds are precisely those which according to his theory ought to have preserved them voiceless, since word stress and musical accent fall together behind the spirant; cp. above. Mr Logeman actually mentions (§ 68) some cases[2] which belong here, and makes in regard to them the, under the circumstances, somewhat astonishing remark: '*Alles draagt er toe bij* om hier een stemhebbende media te voorschijn te roepen' (italics mine). After this we are not surprised to read in § 137 'Interessant was: [ˉ ua _ zeg |ˉ dy] (i.e. in a case of the same order as that just mentioned, where we should

[1] See Note at end.

[2] E.g., *anxiety* etc.

expect according to the author's accent theory a voiceless sound, but find a voiced one. Notice the explanation:) voor: Wat zegt U? Man zal opmerken dat wij hier een uit de *t* van [-Zeçt- y] ontstane gereduceerde *d*, [⁻| zegd y] voor ons hebben die onder langzaam stijgend chromaties aksent tot [d] geworden is of liever [d'] gebleven is onder nadruk.' The author's method is evidently to explain each example by itself, quite careless of the eventuality that two examples, which seem to the ordinary observer to be alike, may thus each receive a different explanation. A consequence of this is that the important factor of the relative frequency of occurrence of his examples, and of the relation between the sporadic and the regular transitions in any language is left quite untouched. It is sufficient for the author that an isolated example 'illustreert 't prinsiepe'; no attempt is however made to delimit the sphere of influence of different principles when they come in conflict with each other. Mr Logeman presents his readers indeed with principles in the abstract, but as to when and why they come of necessity into action he leaves us quite in the dark.

It is not necessary to follow the author in the application of this accent theory to various languages, in all of which he finds to his own satisfaction instances of its action. I will therefore at once sum up his results:

(1) When stress and chromatic accent fall together before a stop or spirant, (*a*) a voiced Media remains voiced in the mid-sound; (*b*) a voiceless Tenuis becomes a voiced Tenuis and may become a voiced Media.

(2) When stress and chromatic accent do not fall together but on successive syllables and a spirant or stop stands between: (*a*) a voiced Media becomes unvoiced and may become a Tenuis; (*b*) a voiceless Tenuis remains voiceless.

(3) When stress and voice fall together after a stop or spirant, the result is the same as in (2).

The worthlessness of these results is clear enough probably from the foregoing. For Mr Logeman they are however scientific verities, and he proceeds in his Appendix to apply them to the explanation of Verner's Law. I do not consider it necessary to follow Mr Logeman through the mazes of his Appendix. It will, I think, be obvious to every one but the author himself, that the accent principle he wishes to apply is the direct opposite of that involved in Verner's Law, just as in the parallel cases in English (see above, p. 560). The case lies as follows: Verner's Law states in its usual formulation that Indo-European voiceless stops are represented in primitive Germanic by voiceless or voiced spirants (which latter of course generally become later voiced stops) according to the position of the original (chromatic) accent. Mr Logeman rejects the necessity of voiceless spirants as 'Zwischenstufen,' and holds that under Verner's Law the original voiceless stops were exchanged at once for voiced stops under the accentual conditions of the Law. This is certainly false, but the critic can afford to give our author plenty of rope at this point. That is to say in Mr Logeman's terminology, the

original Indo-European Tenues were exchanged under Verner's Law for Mediae. Mr Logeman now wishes to elucidate this state of affairs from modern analogies. He believes he has found such analogies in the modern languages examined in his book. He therefore wishes to apply the examples in which he has discovered a variation between original Tenuis and Media in modern times to the explanation of Verner's Law: in other words he wishes to apply the results just given above for this purpose. A typical example for the law thus formulated is the double form according to Mr Logeman of the Dutch word 'better,' namely ˉ| bedər and | beˉtər. Now to establish an analogy Mr Logeman must know the position of both the stress and the musical accent, since his law is stated in terms of both. But all that Mr Logeman knows or can know for certain is the position of the original musical accent. He is plainly not at liberty to conclude that this was the same as that of the stress, and it would not help him if he could. Obviously therefore the analogy between the historic case and the modern is doomed, to begin with, to be imperfect in this respect. Again in the typical modern example for a *preserved Tenuis*, the musical accent *follows* it: but it was only when the original position of the musical accent was *before* the consonant, that in Germanic the Tenuis was preserved (still adhering to Mr Logeman's terminology). It is quite obvious therefore that the actual facts given by Verner's Law are not analogous to Mr Logeman's modern examples. He wishes to apply an analogy where none exists. The following reflection makes this even more obvious: if by means of Mr Logeman's generalisation we tried to deduce the originals of Gothic *fadar*, *brōþar* we should come to the conclusion that they were ˉ| pəter and bhra: ˉ| ter or | bhra: ˉter, not one of which agrees with the actual forms. The absurdities into which Mr Logeman is plunged by his false premisses are almost incredible. But Mr Logeman 'does not mind trouble.' He has the courage 'to take arms against a sea of troubles' and the hopeful disposition which believes that mere opposition will end them. There is no analogy such as Mr Logeman wishes, but not at all dismayed by this, he proceeds to manufacture one. If the given facts do not suit his hypothesis of an analogy they must be changed so as to suit. Therefore Mr Logeman *assumes* that the given accent *changed* to forms which were analogous to his principle. He fixes his attention on the convenient dissyllabic forms and asks us to believe the following complicated, and purely *ad hoc* assumptions: (1) That when the original musical accent was on the first, the stress was on the second syllable and *vice versâ*. (2) That afterwards musical accent and stress fell together on the same syllable, and (3) they fell together on the first syllable when the original musical accent had been on the second, but on the second when the original musical accent had been on the first. Thus for his pair ˉ| bedər and | beˉtər Mr Logeman constructs a quite hypothetical analogous pair ˉ| pəter and bhra: ˉ| ter out of absolutely non-analogous pətér and bhráter. (It must be remarked that Mr Logeman does not use Indo-European forms, probably because he considers them too

hypothetical; but I have introduced pətér and bhráter for the convenience of the philological reader, instead of the Greek forms which he cites.) Comment is superfluous. And yet even supposing that these entirely unsuccessful efforts of Mr Logeman's to construct an analogy out of nothing, had been successful so far as they went—supposing this impossibility for one moment—he would in fact still be as far off from a full analogy as ever, as will appear from the following. The accent principle constructed by Mr Logeman in the first part of his book applies equally to Mediae and Tenues, it produces not merely a variation between original Tenues and Mediae, but also between original Mediae and Tenues. Now Verner's Law only deals with original Tenues —there is no trace of a similar variation in the case of original Mediae. Original *b, d, g,* became without exception *p, t, k* in Germanic, whereas according to Mr Logeman's theory we should have expected the Media to be preserved under certain factors of accent, just as in modern Danish, which Mr Logeman claims (§ 275) as a special analogy to this act of the first shifting, the Mediae are, according to him, still preserved when the accent favours it (see above).

It is a pity that Mr Logeman did not accept the well-meant warning of his friend Dr N. on the subject of Verner's Law, which warning he open-heartedly communicates to the public in his foot-notes. In full consciousness of the possession of a 'revolutionary' theory he set out, as he himself hints, to revolutionise the whole science of comparative philology. A revolutionary, however, whose ideas do not succeed, makes himself ridiculous. Those who wish to take Mr Logeman seriously would be well advised not to read his Appendix. So long as Mr Logeman refrains from historical discussions, his varied acquaintance with phonetical literature, and the wide field of observation which he commands in modern languages, make him an entertaining and stimulating writer. Not that Mr Logeman is altogether to be trusted as an observer of living phenomena. How can he who asserts repeatedly that the 'Blählaut' must be inaudible, and that a voiced Tenuis is acoustically the same as a voiceless one,—how can such a writer profess to distinguish by means of his ear, if and when a Tenuis is voiced?

R. A. Williams.

Dublin.

Note. On the parallel between certain phenomena in Modern English and those of Verner's Law, referred to above, p. 560, see my article in the *Modern Language Review*, II, p. 232 ff. I take this opportunity of making a necessary correction. The first to draw attention to 'Verner's Law in English' was the well-known Danish scholar, O. Jespersen (in his *Studier over Engelske Casus*), not Dr Sweet, as I erroneously stated in that article.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

December, 1908—May, 1909.

GENERAL.

Brugmann, K. und B. Delbrück, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. 2. Bearbeitung. II, ii, 1. Lieferung. Strassburg, Trübner. 11 M.

Fick, A., Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen. 4. Aufl. von A. Bezzenberger. III. Teil von A. Torp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 14 M.

Muszkat-Muszkowski, J., Spartacus. Eine Stoffgeschichte. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 4 M.

Rousselot, P. J., Principes de phonétique expérimentale. 2 vols. Paris, Welter. 60 fr.

Smith, D. Nicol, The Functions of Criticism. A Lecture. London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

Spingarn, J. E., A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance. 2nd ed. New York, Columbia University Press. 1 dol. 50.

Sterzenbach, Th., Ursprung und Entwicklung der Sage vom heiligen Gral. (Forschungen und Funde, II.) Münster, Aschendorff. 1 M. 25.

Traube, L., Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen. Herausg. von F. Boll. I. Zur Paläographie und Handschriftenkunde. Herausg. von P. Lehmann. Munich, C. H. Beck. 15 M.

Warren, T. H., Essays of Poets and Poetry, Ancient and Modern. London, Murray. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Bibliotheca romanica. 66, Boccaccio, Decameron, v; 67—70, Pascal, Les Provinciales. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no. 40 pf.

Hinneberg, P., Die Kultur der Gegenwart. I, xi, 1. Die romanischen Literaturen und Sprachen mit Einschluss des Keltischen. Von H. Zimmer, K. Meyer, L. C. Stern, H. Morf, W. Meyer-Lübke. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 M.

Philologische und volkskundliche Arbeiten Karl Vollmöller zum 16. Oktober 1908 dargeboten. Herausg. von K. Reuschel und K. Gruber. Erlangen, Junge. 15 M.

Latin.

(*Incl. Humanism.*)

Becker, J., Textgeschichte Liudprands von Cremona. (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, III, 2.) Munich, C. H. Beck. 2 M. 50.

Boulting, W., Aeneas Silvius (Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini, Pius II). Orator, Man of Letters, Statesman and Pope. London, Constable. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Loew, E. A., Die ältesten Kalendarien aus Monte Cassino, herausgegeben und untersucht. (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lat. Phil. des Mittelalters, III, 3.) Munich, C. H. Beck. 6 M.

Merker, P., Simon Lemnius. Ein Humanistenleben. (Quellen und Forschungen, CIV.) Strassburg, Trübner. 3 M.

Meyer, W., Die Arundel-Sammlung mittellateinischer Lieder. (Abhandlungen der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, XI, 2.) Berlin, Weidmann. 3 M. 50.

Neff, K., Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus. Kritische Ausgabe. (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lat. Phil. des Mittelalters, III, 4.) Munich, C. H. Beck. 10 M.

Schroeter, A., Beiträge zur Geschichte der neulateinischen Poesie Deutschlands und Hollands. (Palaestra, LXXVII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 9 M.

Silviae vel potius Aetheriae peregrinatio ad loca sancta. Herausg. von W. Heraeus. (Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte, I.) Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M. 20.

Italian.

Battocchio, G., Le poesie liriche di G. Giusti. Con introduzione e appendice. Feltre, Zanussi. 1 L. 50.

Beltrami, P., Maghinardo Pagani da Susinana. Commento sopra due luoghi della Divina Commedia. Faenza. 2 L.

Boeri, A., Studî foscoliani : Ugo Foscolo e la Bibbia. Ugo Foscolo storico. Palermo, Reber. 1 L. 50.

Carducci, G., Cavalleria e umanesimo. Bologna, Zanichelli. 4 L.

Dante Alighieri, La Divina Commedia. Edited and annotated by C. H. Grandgent. Vol. I. Inferno. Boston, D. C. Heath. 1 dol. 25.

Dante Alighieri, The Divine Comedy. Translated by E. Wilberforce. 3 vols. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Federici, E., Due esamazioni delle opere teatrale di Camillo Federici da Garessio, per cura di E. Federici. Venice, Tip. Emiliana. 3 L.

Ferri, F., La poesia popolare in Antonio Pucci. Bologna, Beltrami. 4 L.

Filomusi, G. L., Studî su Dante. Città di Castello. 5 L.

Grashey, L., Giacinto Andrea Cicogninis Leben und Werke. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Phil., XLIII.) Leipzig, Deichert. 3 M. 50.

Levi, T., Francesco di Vanozzo e la lirica nelle Corti lombarde durante la seconda metà del secolo XIV. Rome, E. Loescher. 20 L.

Machiavelli, N., Opere poetiche, con introduzione e note di G. Gigli. (Biblioteca Nazionale.) Florence, Le Monnier. 2 L. 50.

Novella di Paganino e di Messer Ricciardo. Metrische Bearbeitung einer Novelle Boccaccios. Faksimile eines um 1500 wohl in Florenz hergestellten Druckes im Besitze der kgl. Universitätsbibliothek in Erlangen. Erlangen, M. Mencke. 2. M.

Poletto, G., La santa Scrittura nelle opere e nel pensiero di Dante Alighieri. Siena, S. Bernardino. 4 L.

Reade, W. H. V., The Moral System of Dante's Inferno. London, Frowde. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Toynbee, Paget, Dante in English Literature. From Chaucer to Cary. 2 vols. London, Methuen. 21*s.* net.

Vernon, W. W., Readings in the Paradiso of Dante. Chiefly based on the Commentary of Benvenuto da Imola. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London, Methuen. 15*s.* net.

Vossler, K., Die göttliche Komödie. Entwicklungsgeschichte und Erklärung. II, 1. Die literarische Entwicklungsgeschichte. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 5 M.

Provençal.

Giraut de Bornelh, Sämtliche Lieder. Mit Übersetzung, Kommentar und Glossar. Herausg. von A. Kolsen. I, 3. Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

Spanish.

Arteaga y Pereira, F. de, Nine Spanish Poems, collected by. London, Frowde, 1*s.* net.

Clarke, H. B., Spanish Literature. An Elementary Handbook. London, Sonnenschein. 6*s.*

Cotarelo. Migajas del Ingenio. Colección rarísima de entremeses, bailes y loas reimpresa con prólogo y notas. Madrid, Imp. de la 'Rev. de Archiv.'

González-Blanco, A., Historia de la Novela en España desde el Romanticismo á nuestros días. Madrid, Sáenz de Jubera.

Granada, L. de, Obras. Edición crítica y completa por Fr. J. Cuervo. Tomos V—IX. Madrid, Fuentenebro.

Klausner, G., Die drei Diamanten des Lope de Vega und die schöne Magelone. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, 39.) Berlin, Felber. 3 M. 50.

Menéndez Pidal, R., Cantar de Mio Cid. Texto, Gramática y Vocabulario. I. Madrid, Bailly-Baillière.

Rodríguez Villa, A., Crónicas del Gran Capitán. (Nueva Biblioteca de Autores españoles, X.) Madrid, Bailly-Baillière.

Pereda, J. M. de, Pedro Sánchez. With Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by R. E. Bassett. Boston, Ginn.

French.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Berthon, H. E. et V. G. Starkey, Tables synoptiques de Phonologie de l'ancien Français. London, Frowde. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Espe, H., Die Interjektionen im Altfranzösischen. Berlin, Trenkel. 3 M.

Mélanges Havet. Philologie et linguistique, mélanges offerts à L. Havet par ses anciens élèves et ses amis. Paris, Hachette. 20 fr.

Meyer-Lübke, W., Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache. I. Laut- und Flexionslehre. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, I, 2.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M.

Verrier, A. J. et R. Onillon, Glossaire étymologique et historique des patois et des parlers de l'Anjou. 2 tomes. Paris, Grassin. 25 fr.

Wilmotte, M., Études critiques sur la tradition littéraire en France. Paris, H. Champion. 3 fr. 50.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Alexis, La Vie de Saint. Poème du XI^e^ siècle. Texte critique par G. Paris. Nouv. édition. Paris, Champion. 1 fr. 50.

Aubry, G., Trouvères et troubadours. Paris, F. Alcan. 3 fr. 50.

Borodine, M., La femme et l'amour au XII^e^ siècle, d'après les poèmes de Chrétien de Troyes. Paris, Picard. 5 fr.

Brockstedt, G., Das altfranzösische Siegfriedlied. Eine Rekonstruktion. Kiel, R. Cordes. 8 M.

Gelzer, H., Einleitung zu einer kritischen Ausgabe des altfranzösischen Yderromans (Diss.). Halle, Waisenhaus.

Pisan, Christine de, The Book of the Duke of True Lovers. Translated into English. (King's Classics.) London, Chatto and Windus. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Arnarvon, J., Tartuffe. Étude sur la mise en scène et la tradition. Paris, Ollendorff. 3 fr. 50.

Bastier, P., Victor Hugo und seine Zeit. Eine Einführung in das Studium des Dichters. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 3 M. 50.

Béranger, P. J. de, Œuvres inédites. Paris, Daragon. 8 fr.

Bossuet, Correspondance. Nouv. éd. avec lettres inédites publiée par Ch. Urbain et E. Levesque. Tome I (1651–76). Paris, Hachette. 7 fr. 50.

Brandes, G., Voltaire in seinem Verhältnis zu Friedrich dem Grossen und J. J. Rousseau. Berlin, Marquardt. 3 M.

Brun, P., Savinien de Cyrano de Bergerac, gentilhomme parisien. L'histoire et la légende. Paris, H. Daragon. 12 fr.

Brunetière, F., Histoire de la littérature française classique. I. De Marot à Montaigne. Paris, Ch. Delagrave. 7 fr. 50.

Buffenoir, H., Le prestige de J. J. Rousseau. Paris, E. Paul. 7 fr. 50.

Clarétie, L., Histoire de la littérature française. Tome IV. Le dix-neuvième siècle. Paris, Ollendorff. 7 fr. 50.

Cor, R., Anatole France et la pensée contemporaine. Paris, Pelletan. 5 fr.

Crisenoy, P. de, Essai sur J. A. Barbey d'Aurevilley. Paris, Bibl. des entretiens idéalistes. 2 fr. 50.

Cushing, M. G., Pierre Le Tourneur. (Columbia Univ. Studies in Romance Philology and Literature.) New York, Macmillan. 1 dol. 50.

Descharmes, R., Flaubert, sa vie, son caractère et ses idées avant 1857. Paris, Ferroud. 6 fr.

Dornis, J., Essai sur Leconte de Lisle. Paris, Ollendorff. 3 fr. 50.

Doumic, R., George Sand. Dix conférences sur sa vie et son œuvre. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

Dufay, P., Victor Hugo à vingt ans, glanes romantiques. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Ettlinger, T., Benjamin Constant. Berlin, Fleischel. 5 M.

Furetière, A., The Poésies Diverses. A Partial Reprint from the Edition of 1604 edited by I. Bronk. New York, Stechert. 1 dol. 75.

Gunnell, D., Stendhal et l'Angleterre. Paris, C. Bosse. 6. fr.

Harper, G. M., C. A. Sainte-Beuve. (French Men of Letters.) Philadelphia. 1 dol. 50 net.

Klatt, W., Molières Beziehungen zum Hirtendrama. Mit einer Vorstudie: Haupttypen der Hirtendichtung vor Molière. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 50.

Küchler, W., Französische Romantik. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Labonne, Le sixième livre de Rabelais. Paris, G. Ficker. 3 fr. 50.

Lafenestre, G., Molière. (Les grands écrivains français.) Paris, Hachette. 2 fr.

Lanson, G., Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française moderne. Fasc. I. XVI^e siècle. Paris, Hachette. 4 fr.

Lepelletier, E., Émile Zola. Sa vie, son œuvre. Paris, Mercure de France. 7 fr. 50.

Lepelletier, E., Paul Verlaine, his Life, his Work. Transl. by E. M. Lang. London, Laurie. 21*s.* net.

Mahn, P., Guy de Maupassant, sein Leben und seine Werke. Berlin, E. Fleischel. 8 M.

Marot, C., Œuvres choisies, notes et glossaire par E. Voizard. Paris, Garnier. 3 fr. 50.

Masson, P. M., Fénelon et Mme Guyon. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Montaigne, M. de, Essais. Publ. par F. Strowski. Tome II. Paris, Champion. 25 fr.

Montaigne, M. de, Essays done into English by J. Florio. Introd. by Th. Seccombe. 3 vols. London, Richards. 31*s.* 6*d.* net.

Musset, A. de, Œuvres complètes. Notes par E. Biré. IV, VI. Paris, Garnier frères. Each 3 fr. 50.

Pons, A. A., J. J. Rousseau et le théâtre. Geneva, Jullien. 5 fr. 50.

Prisonnier (Le) desconforté du château de Loches. Poème inédit du XV^e siècle. Introduction, notes et glossaire par P. Champion. Paris, Champion. 5 fr.

Retinger, J. H., Le conte fantastique dans le romantisme français. Paris, B. Grasset. 2 fr.

Rudler, G., La jeunesse de B. Constant (1767–94). Paris, Colin. 10 fr.

Rudler, G., Bibliographie critique des œuvres de B. Constant. Paris, Colin, 3 fr. 50.

Schoen, H., F. Coppée. L'homme et le poète, 1842–1908. Paris, Fischbacher. 2 fr.

Séché, L., Études d'histoire romantique. Le cénacle de la muse française (1823–27). Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Stendhal, Correspondance (1800-42). Publiée par A. Paupe et P. A. Cheramy. 3 vols. Paris, C. Bosse. 20 fr.

Vianey, J., Le pétrarquisme en France au xvi^e^ siècle. Montpellier, Coulet et fils. 8 fr.

Virely, A., R. C. Guilbert de Pixérécourt. Paris, E. Ralier. 10 fr.

Voltaire, Lettres philosophiques. Introduction par G. Lauson. i. Paris, Cornély. 5 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Golther, W., Religion und Mythus der Germanen. Leipzig, Verlag Deutsche Zukunft. 4 M.

Gothic.

Feist, S., Etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache. i. Teil (A—M). Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

Dutch and Low German.

Alberdingk Thÿm, J. A., Werken. Verzameld en gerangschikt met inleiding en overzicht door J. F. M. Sterck. ix. Amsterdam, C. L. van Langenhuysen. 2 fl. 90.

Dyserinck, J., Fr. Haverschmidt (Piet Paaltjens). Schiedam, H. A. M. Roelants. 2 fl. 50.

Petsch, R., Theophilus. Mittelniederdeutsches Drama in drei Fassungen. (Untersuchungen und Texte, ii.) Heidelberg, Winter. 2 M.

Scandinavian.

Andersen, V., Tider og Typer af dansk Aands Historie. i. Humanisme. 1. Erasmus, ii. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 kr.

Baggesen, J., Labyrinten, ved Louis Bobé. (Mindesmærker af Danmarks Nationallitteratur, ii.) Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 kr.

Esswein, H., A. Strindberg im Lichte seines Lebens und seiner Werke. Munich, G. Müller. 4 M.

Moses, M. J., H. Ibsen, the Man and his Plays. New York, Mitchell Kennerley. 1 dol. 50 net.

Olrik, A., Nordisches Geistesleben in heidnischer und frühchristlicher Zeit. Übertragen von W. Ranisch. (Germanische Bibliothek, i, v, 1.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 5 M.

Paasche, F., Ibsens Gildet paa Solhaug. (Smaaskrifter fra det litteraturhistoriske Seminar, v.) Christiania, Aschehoug. 1 kr. 75.

Þiðriks Saga af Bern. Udg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved H. Bertelsen. 3. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 kr. 50.

Troye, V., H. Wergeland i hans digtning. Udgivet ved H. Eitrem. Christiania, Cammermeyer. 5 kr.

Uddgren, G., A. Strindberg. Början till en biografi. Göteborg, Aahlen och Aakerlund. 2 kr. 75.

Vedel, V., Holger Drachmann. Copenhagen, Schönberg. 1 kr. 50.

Volsunga Saga ok Ragnars Saga Loðbrókar. Udg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved M. Olsen. 3. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 kr. 50.

Völuspa. Done into English out of the Icelandic of the Elder Edda by A. K. Coomaraswamy. London, D. Nutt. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wimmer, L. F. A., De danske Kune mindesmærker, undersøgte og tolkede. iv, ii. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 15 kr.

English.

(*a*) *General (incl. Language).*

Bödtker, A. T., Critical Contributions to Early English Syntax. First Series. (Videnskabs-Selsk. Skrifter, II Hist. Filos. Klasse 1908, No. 6.) Christiania, Dybwad. 1 kr. 20.

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by S. Lee. Vols. x–xiv. London, Smith, Elder. Each 15*s.* net.

Jespersen, O., Större engelsk Grammatik paa historisk Grundlag. I. Lyd og Skrift. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr. 50.

Jost, K., Beon und Wesan, eine syntaktische Untersuchung. (Anglistische Forschungen, xxvi.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M. 60.

Klump, W., Die altenglischen Handwerkernamen sachlich und sprachlich erläutert. (Anglistische Forschungen, xxiv.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M. 40.

Metzger, E., Zur Betonung der lateinisch-römischen Wörter im Neuenglischen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Zeit von ca. 1560 bis ca. 1660. (Anglistische Forschungen, xxv.) Heidelberg, Winter. 2 M.

Morris, J., Organic History of English Words. I. Old English. Strassburg, Trübner. 3 M.

Verrier, P., Essai sur les principes de la métrique anglaise. Paris, Welter. 30 fr.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Dodd, L. H., A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies. (Yale Studies in English.) New York, Henry Holt. 1 dol. net.

Gonser, P., Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des hl. Guthlac. Mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Miniaturen. (Anglistische Forschungen, xxvii.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M.

Gummere, F. B., The Oldest English Epic. Translated into the original metres with Introduction and Notes. New York, Macmillan. 1 dol. 10 net.

Schück, H., Studier i Beowulfsagan. (Uppsala Universitets Aarsskrift. Program, I.) Upsala, Akad. bokh. 1 kr.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Albert, F., Über Thomas Heywoods 'The Life and Death of Hector,' eine neue Bearbeitung von Lydgates 'Troy Book.' (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Phil., xlii.) Leipzig, Deichert. 4 M. 80.

Barbour, J., The Bruce. Edited by W. M. Mackenzie. London, Black. 5*s.* net.

Beaumont, F. and J. Fletcher, Works, Vol. vi. Edited by A. R. Waller. (Cambridge English Classics.) Cambridge, University Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Beeching, H. C., William Shakespeare, Player, Playmaker and Poet. A Reply to Mr George Greenwood. London. Smith, Elder. 2*s.* net.

Beiträge zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas. Herausg. von W. Bang. xxiii. J. Forde, Dramatische Werke, herausg. von W. Bang. 22 fr. 50. xxiv. Everyman, reprinted by W. W. Greg from the edition of J. Skot. 2 fr. xxv. Bale's Kynge Johan nach der Handschrift herausg. von W. Bang. 1 fr. xxvi. Sir Gyles Goosecappe. Nach der Quarto 1606 herausg. von W. Bang und R. Brotanek. 4 fr. 50. Louvain, Uystpruyst.

Bible, The Authorised Version of the English, 1611. 5 vols. (Cambridge English Classics.) Cambridge, University Press. 20*s.* net.

Boardman, G. N., Shakespeare. Five Lectures. New York, Revell. 1 dol. net.

Bradley, A. C., Oxford Lectures on Poetry. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* net.

Campion, T., Complete English Works. Edited by A. H. Bullen. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Carlyle, T. and Jane W., Love Letters. Edited by Alexander Carlyle. 2 vols. London, Lane. 25*s.* net.

Clarke, M. C., Shakespeare Proverbs. Edited by W. J. Rolfe. New York, Putnam. 1 dol. 50 net.

Conant, M. P., The Oriental Tale in England in the Eighteenth Century. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Cook, A. S., Concordance to the English Poems of Thomas Gray. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co. 2 dol. 50 net.

Cosentino, G., Le Tragedie di Shakespeare. Bologna, Beltrami. 10 L.

De Quincey, T., Literary Criticism. Edited by H. Darbishire. London, Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dowden, E., Milton in the Eighteenth Century, 1701–50. (British Academy.) London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

Fletcher, Giles and Phineas, Poetical Works. Vol. II. Edited by F. S. Boas. (Cambridge English Classics.) Cambridge, University Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gayley, C. M., Plays of our Forefathers and some of the Traditions upon which the Plays were founded. London, Chatto and Windus. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Geest, S., Der Sensualismus bei John Keats. (Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, I.) Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M. 50.

Goll, A., Criminal Types in Shakespeare. London, Methuen. 5*s.* net.

Greenwood, G. G., In re Shakespeare. Beeching *v.* Greenwood. A Rejoinder. London, Lane. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hill, H. W., Sidney's Arcadia and the Elizabethan Drama. (Univ. of Nevada Studies.) Reno, Nev., U.S.A.

Johnson, C. F., Shakespeare and his Critics. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co. 1 dol. 50 net.

Kellner, L., Die englische Literatur im Zeitalter der Königin Viktoria. Leipzig, Tauchnitz. 10 M.

Lanier, S., Shakespere and his Forerunners. New York, Doubleday, Page. 1 dol. 60.

Leach, A. F., Milton as Schoolboy and Schoolmaster. (British Academy.) London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

Livingstone, L. S., A Bibliography of the First Editions in book form of the Writings of H. W. Longfellow. New York, Dodd, Mead. 3 dol. net.

Lubbock, P., Samuel Pepys. (Literary Lives Series.) London, Hodder and Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mackail, S. W. Swinburne. A Lecture. London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

Malone Society Reprints, 1908. The Tragedy of Locrine, 1595. The Interlude of Calisto and Melebea. The Life of Sir John Oldcastle, 1600.

MEHR, O., Neue Beiträge zur Leekunde und Kritik, insbesondere zum 'Cäsar Borgia' und zur 'Sophonisba.' (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XXXVII.) Berlin, Felber. 3 M.

Milton Memorial Lectures, 1908. Read before the Royal Society of Literature. Edited by P. W. Ames. London, Frowde. 6*s.* net.

OTWAY, T., The Orphan and Venice Preserved. Edited by C. F. McClumpha. (Belles-Lettres Series.) Boston, D. C. Heath. 60 c. net.

PERCY, T. and W. SHENSTONE, Ein Briefwechsel aus der Entstehungszeit der 'Reliques of Ancient English Poetry.' Herausg. von H. Hecht. (Quellen und Forschungen, III.) Strassburg, Trübner. 5 M.

PANCOAST, H. S., An Introduction to American Literature. London, Bell. 4*s.* 6*d.*

PHILIP, A. J., A Dickens Dictionary. London, Routledge. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

POE, E. A., Complete Works. 10 vols. Edited by E. C. Stedman and G. E. Woodberry. New York, Duffield. 15 dols.

POE, E. A., The Last Letters to Sarah Helen Whitman. Edited by J. A. Harrison. New York, Putnam. 2 dol. 50.

POETZSCHE, R., Samuel Richardsons Belesenheit. Eine literarische Untersuchung. (Kieler Studien zur englischen Philologie, Neue Folge, IV.) Kiel, Cordes. 3 M.

RALEIGH, W., Shakspeare. (Eversley Series.) London, Macmillan. 4*s.* net.

ROBERTSON, J. G., Milton's Fame on the Continent. (British Academy.) London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

RUSHTON, W. L. Shakespeare and 'The Arte of English Poesie.' Liverpool, H. Young. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

RUSHTON, W. L., Shakespeare's Legal Maxims. Liverpool, H. Young. 2*s.* net.

RUSSELL, C. E., Thomas Chatterton, the Marvellous Boy. London, Richards. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

SCHMIDT, K., R. Browning's Verhältnis zu Frankreich. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XXXVIII.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M. 50.

SÉLINCOURT, B. de, William Blake. London, Duckworth. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

SHAKESPEARE, W., All's Well that Ends Well, edited by W. G. B. Stone; The Merchant of Venice, The Tempest, edited by F. J. Furnivall. (Old Spelling Edition.) London, Chatto and Windus. Each 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SHAKESPEARE, W., Comedies, Histories and Tragedies. Faithfully reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1632. London, Methuen. 84*s.* net.

SHAKESPEARE, W., King Lear, Macbeth, Timon of Athens, Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus, Sonnets, Poems (2 parts). (Renaissance edition.) London, G. G. Harrap. Each 7*s.* 6*d.*

SHAKESPEARE, W., Othello in Paralleldruck nach der ersten Quarto und ersten Folio mit den Lesarten der zweiten Quarto. Herausg. von M. M. A. Schröer. Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M. 70.

SHAKESPEARE, W., The Bankside Restoration Shakespeare. IV. Antony and Cleopatra by J. Dryden; V. A Law against Lovers by W. Davenant. Westfield, N.J., Shakespeare Press. Each 5 dol.

SIDGWICK, F., The Cavalier to his Lady. Love poems of the Seventeenth Century. (King's Classics.) London, Chatto and Windus. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

STANTON, T., A Manual of American Literature. New York, Putnam. 1 dol. 75 net.

SWINBURNE, A. C., Three Plays of Shakespeare. (Library of Living Thought.) London, Harper. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SYLVESTER, J., The Divine Weeks mainly translated from the French of William de Saluste, lord of the Bartas. Edited by T. W. Haight. Wankesha, Wis., H. M. Youmans. 2 dols.

TENNYSON, A., Select Poems. Edited by A. MacMechan. (Belles-Lettres Series, Section VI.) Boston, D. C. Heath. 60 c. net.

THOMPSON, F., Shelley. London, Burns and Oates. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THOMSON, J., Poetical Works. Edited by J. L. Robertson. (Oxford edition.) London, Frowde.

TUCKER, S. M., Verse Satire in England before the Renaissance. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English.) New York, Macmillan. 1 dol. net.

TURBERVILE, G., Booke of Hunting, 1576. (Tudor and Stuart Library.) London, Frowde.

VOIGT, E., Shakespeares Naturschilderungen. (Anglistische Forschungen, XXVIII.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M. 80.

WALTER, E., Entstehungsgeschichte von W. M. Thackerays 'Vanity Fair.' (Palaestra, LXXIX.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 50.

WARD, A. W. and A. R. WALLER, The Cambridge History of English Literature. III. Renascence and Reformation. Cambridge, University Press. 9*s.* net.

WEILEN, A. VON, Hamlet auf der deutschen Bühne bis zur Gegenwart. (Schriften der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, III.) Berlin, G. Reimer. 4 M. 50.

WILSON, T., Arte of Rhetorique. Edited by G. H. Mair. (Tudor and Stuart Library.) London, Frowde. 5*s.* net.

WOODS, M. A., The Characters of Paradise Lost. London, J. Ouseley. 2*s.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

BIESE, A., Deutsche Literaturgeschichte. II. Munich, C. H. Beck. 5 M. 50.

FASSBENDER, J., Die schlettstadter Vergilglossen und ihre Verwandten. (Untersuchungen zur deutschen Sprachgeschichte, II.) Strassburg, Trübner. 5 M.

FRANCK, J., Altfränkische Grammatik. Laut- und Flexionslehre. (Grammatiken der althochdeutschen Dialekte, II.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 7 M. 80.

GERBET, E., Grammatik der Mundart des Vogtlandes. Lautlehre. (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken deutscher Mundarten, VIII.) Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel. 18 M.

KÖNNECKE, G., Deutscher Literaturatlas. Mit einer Einführung von Chr. Muff. Marburg, Elwert. 6 M.

MOSER, V., Historisch-grammatische Einführung in die frühneuhochdeutsche Schriftdialekte. Halle, Waisenhaus. 8 M.

SCHINDLING, B., Die Murbacher Glossen. Ein Beitrag zur ältesten Sprachgeschichte des Oberrheins. (Untersuchungen zur deutschen Sprachgeschichte, I.) Strassburg, Trübner. 4 M.

Schönhoff, H., Emsländische Grammatik. Laut- und Formenlehre der emsländischen Mundarten. (Sammlung german. Elementar- und Handbücher, I, 8.) Heidelberg, Winter. 7 M.

Thomas, C., A History of German Literature. London, Heinemann. 6*s*.

Wiegand, F. L. K., Deutsches Wörterbuch. 5. Aufl. I. Band. Giessen, Töpelmann. 12 M.

Wrede, F., Deutsche Dialektgeographie. Berichte und Studien über G. Wenkers Sprachatlas des Deutschen Reiches, I–II. Marburg, Elwert. 3 M. 20 and 5 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Bithell, I., The Minnesingers. Vol. I. Translations. London, Longmans. 5*s*. net.

Boer, R. C., Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Entwicklung der Nibelungensaga. III. Band. Halle, Waisenhaus. 8 M.

Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters. Herausg. von der königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. X. Der sogenannte St. Georgener Prediger, aus der Freiburger und der Karlsruher Handschrift, herausg. von K. Rieder. 15 M. XII. Hans Folz, Meisterlieder aus der Münchener Originalhandschrift und der Weimarer Handschrift Q. 566 herausg. von A. L. Mayer. 16 M. 60. XIV. Kleinere mittelhochdeutsche Erzählungen, Fabeln und Lehrgedichte. II. Die Wolfenbüttler Priamelhandschrift. Herausg. von K. Euling. 9 M. Berlin, Weidmann.

Meier, J., Werden und Leben des Volksepos. Rede. Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 20.

Pohnert, L., Kritik und Metrik von Wolframs Titurel. (Prager deutsche Studien, XII.) Prague, Bellmann. 3 kr. 50.

Ranke, F., Sprache und Stil im Wälschen Gast des Thomasin von Circlaria. (Palaestra, LXVIII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 80.

Runge, O., Die Metamorphosen-Verdeutschung Albrechts von Halberstadt. (Palaestra, LXXIII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 50.

Schönbach, A. E., Mitteilungen aus altdeutschen Handschriften. X. Die Regensburger Klarissenregel. (Aus 'Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. der Wissenschaften in Wien.') Wien, Hölder. 2 kr.

Sievers, P., Die Accente in althochdeutschen und altsächsischen Handschriften. (Palaestra, CVII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Arndt, E. M., Sämtliche Werke. Bearbeitet von E. Schirmer, IX, X, XII, XIII. Magdeburg, Verlags-Anstalt. Each 3 M.

Berend, E., Jean Pauls Ästhetik. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, 35.) Berlin, Duncker. 13 M. 50.

Bode, W., Goethes Leben im Garten am Stern. Berlin, Mittler. 5 M.

Böhtlingk, A., Shakespeare und unsere Klassiker. I. Lessing und Shakespeare. Leipzig, Eckardt. 3 M.

Brentano, C., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von C. Schüddekopf. V. Godwi. München, Müller. 6 M.

Brentano, C., and S. Mereau, Briefwechsel. Herausg. von H. Amelung. 2 Bde. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 7 M.

DICKERHOFF, H., Die Entstehung der Jobsiade. (Forschungen und Funde, I.) Münster, Aschendorff. 5 M.

ECKERTZ, E., Heine und sein Witz. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XXXVI.) Berlin, Felber. 4 M.

EICHLER, F., Die deutsche Bibel des Erasmus Stratter in der Universitätsbibliothek zu Graz. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 6 M.

FEISE, E., Der Knittelvers des jungen Goethe. Leipzig, Röder und Schunke. 1 M. 80.

FITTBOGEN, G., Die sprachliche und metrische Form der Hymnen Goethes. Genetisch dargestellt. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

FRIEDRICH, TH., Die 'Anmerkungen übers Theater' des Dichters J. M. R. Lenz. (Probefahrten, XIII.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 4 M. 80.

GEIBEL, E., Jugendbriefe. Bonn, Berlin, Griechenland. Berlin, K. Curtius. 5 M.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Werke. Weimar-Ausgabe. IV (Briefe), 43, 45, 46. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 6 M. 80; 6 M. 80; 6 M. 20.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Briefe an Charlotte von Stein. Herausg. von J. Fränkel. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. 3 Bände. Jena, Diederichs. 9 M.

GRABBE, C. D., Sämtliche Werke in 6 Bänden. Herausg. von O. Nieten. Leipzig, Hesse. 3 M.

GRANTZON, H., Geschichte des Göttinger und des Vossischen Musenalmanachs. (Berliner Beiträge zur german. und roman. Philologie, XXXIV.) Berlin, Ebering. 2 M. 80.

HAERTEL, M. H., German Literature in American Magazines, 1846 to 1880. (Univ. of Wisconsin Bulletin. Philology and Literature Series.) Madison, Wis. U.S.A. 50 c.

HAUFFEN, A., Neue Fischart-Studien. (Ergänzungshefte zu Euphorion, VII.) Vienna, Fromme. 7 kr.

HEINSE, W., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von C. Schüddekopf. VII. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 6 M.

HERDER, J. G. VON, Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von B. Suphan. XIV. Berlin, Weidmann. 9 M.

HILSENBECK, F., Aristophanes und die deutsche Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts. (Berliner Beiträge zur german. und roman. Philologie, XXXIV.) Berlin, Ebering. 2 M. 80.

JAHN, O., Goethe und Leipzig. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 2 M.

KNIPPEL, R., Schillers Verhältnis zur Idylle. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, VIII.) Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 3 M.

KOSSMANN, E. F., Der deutsche Musenalmanach, 1833–39. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 7 fl. 50.

LENZ, J. M. R., Gesammelte Schriften in 4 Bänden. Herausg. von E. Lewy. I. Dramen. Berlin, Cassirer. 5 M. 50.

LICHTENBERG, G. C., Aphorismen. Nach den Handschriften herausg. von A. Leitzman. V (1793–99). (Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrh., 141.) Berlin, Behr. 5 M.

LILIENCRON, D. VON, Sämtliche Werke. XI, XII, XV. Berlin, Schuster und Loeffler. Each 2 M.

LUDWIG, A., Schiller und die deutsche Nachwelt. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 M.

MURET, M., La littérature allemande d'aujourd'hui. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

NADLER, J., Eichendorffs Lyrik. Ihre Technik und ihre Geschichte. (Prager deutsche Studien, x.) Prague, Bellmann. 6 M.

OLSCHKI, L., G. B. Guarinis Pastor Fido in Deutschland. Leipzig, Haessel. 2 M. 50.

PAYER VON THURN, R., Wiener Haupt- und Staatsaktionen. (Schriften des literarischen Vereins in Wien.) Vienna, Fromme.

PFLUG, E., Suchensinn und seine Dichtungen. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XXXII.) Breslau, Marcus. 3 M. 20.

PREITZ, M., Gottfried Kellers dramatische Bestrebungen. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, XII.) Marburg, Elwert. 4 M. 40.

RAUSSE, H., Zur Geschichte des spanischen Schelmenromans in Deutschland. (Münstersche Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, VIII.) Münster, Schöningh. 2 M. 40.

SAAR, F. VON, Sämtliche Werke in 2 Bänden. Herausg. von J. Minor. Leipzig, Hesse. 8 M.

SCHENKER, M., Ch. Batteux und seine Nachahmungstheorie in Deutschland. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte. Neue Folge, II.) Leipzig, Haessel. 3 M.

SCHILLER, CHARLOTTE VON, und ihre Freunde. Auswahl aus ihrer Korrespondenz. Herausg. von L. Geiger. Berlin, Bondy. 5 M.

SCHNEIDERWIRTH, M., Das katholische deutsche Kirchenlied unter dem Einflusse Gellerts und Klopstocks. (Forschungen und Funde, I.) Münster, Aschendorff. 5 M.

SEILER, J., Die Anschauungen Goethes von der deutschen Sprache. Stuttgart, Cotta. 3 M.

SENGER, J. H., Der bildliche Ausdruck in den Werken Heinrich von Kleists. (Teutonia, VIII.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 2 M.

SEUFFERT, B., Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe. V. (Aus 'Abhandlungen d. preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften.') Berlin, Reimer. 4 M.

SIMONSEN, K., Goethes Naturfølelse. Copenhagen, Hagerup. 4 kr. 75.

SOMMER, R., Goethe im Lichte der Vererbungslehre. Leipzig, J. A. Barth. 3 M.

SPIERO, H., Geschichte der deutschen Lyrik seit Claudius. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 254.) Leipzig, Trübner. 1 M.

VETTER, F., Der junge Haller. Nach seinem Briefwechsel mit J. Gossler aus den Jahren 1728–38. Bern, Francke. 2 fr.

VOSS, J. H., Homers Odyssee. Herausg. von H. Feigl. Vienna, Konegen. 12 kr. 50.

WALZEL, O. F., Hebbel-Probleme. Studien. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte. Neue Folge, I.) Leipzig, Haessel. 3 M.

WIELAND, C. M., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von der deutschen Kommission der kgl. preuss. Akademie. I. Abteilung, Werke. 1. Poetische Jugendwerke. II. Abteilung, Übersetzungen. 1. Shakespears theatralische Werke, 1—2. Berlin, Weidmann. 9 M.; 7 M. 20.

WOLF-CIRIAN, F., Grillparzers Frauengestalten. Stuttgart, Cotta. 4 M.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.